00110766

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 09 July, 2016

AN

Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory,

ANTIENT AND MODERN,

FROM

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,

TO THE

BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:

IN WHICH

The Riſe, Progreſs, and Variations of CHURCH POWER

ARE CONSIDERED

In their Connexion with the State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY, and the POLITICAL HISTORY of EUROPE during that Period.

110766

By the late learned

JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D.D.

And Chancellor of the Univerſity of GOTTINGEN.

Tranſlated from the ORIGINAL LATIN,

And accompanied with NOTES and CHRONOLOGICAL-TABLES,

By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, D.D.

To the whole is added AN ACCURATE INDEX.

A NEW EDITION.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND.

M DCC XC.

00110766

THE

FIFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church.

The ſtate of the Roman empire.

I. IN order to arrive at a true knowledge of the cauſes, to which we are to attribute the outward ſtate of the church, and the events which happened to it during this century, we muſt keep in view the civil hiſtory of this period of time. It is, therefore, proper to obſerve, that, in the beginning of this century, the Roman empire was divided into two diſtinct ſovereignties, of which the one comprehended the eaſtern provinces, the other, thoſe of the weſt. ARCADIUS, the emperor of the eaſt, reigned at *Conſtantinople*; and HONORIUS, who governed the weſtern provinces, choſe *Ravenna* for the place of his reſidence. This latter prince, remarkable only for the ſweetneſs of his temper, and the goodneſs of his heart, neglected the great affairs of the empire, and, inattentive to the weighty duties of his ſtation, held the reins of government with an unſteady hand. The Goths took advantage of this criminal indolence; made incurſions into *Italy*; laid waſte its faireſt pro-

CENT. V. PART I.

vinces; and ſometimes carried their deſolations as far as *Rome*, which they ravaged and plundered in the moſt dreadful manner. Theſe calamities, which fell upon the weſtern part of the empire from the Gothic depredations, were followed by others ſtill more dreadful under the ſucceeding emperors. A fierce and warlike people, iſſuing out of *Germany*, overſpread *Italy*, *Gaul*, and *Spain*, the nobleſt of all the European provinces, and erected new kingdoms in theſe fertile countries; and ODOACER, at laſt, at the head of the Heruli, having conquered AUGUSTULUS, in the year 476, gave the mortal blow to the weſtern empire, and reduced all *Italy* under his dominion. About ſixteen years after this, THEODORIC, king of the Oſtrogoths, made war upon theſe Barbarian invaders, at the requeſt of ZENO, emperor of the eaſt, conquered ODOACER in ſeveral battles, and obtained, as the fruits of his victories, a kingdom for the Oſtrogoths in *Italy*, which ſubſiſted under various turns of fortune from the year 493 to 552 [*a*].

Theſe new monarchs of the weſt pretended to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the emperors who reſided at *Conſtantinople*, and gave ſome faint external marks of a diſpoſition to reign in ſubordination to them; but, in reality, they ruled with an abſolute independence, in their reſpective governments, and, as appears particularly by the dominion exerciſed by THEODORIC in *Italy*, left nothing remaining to the eaſtern emperors but a mere ſhadow of power and authority [*b*].

II. Theſe

[*a*] See, for a fuller illuſtration of this branch of hiſtory, the learned work of DE BOS, intitled, *Hiſtoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoiſe*, tom. i. p. 258; as alſo MASCOW's *Hiſtory of the Germans*.

[*b*] CAR. DU FRESNE, *Diſſert.* xxiii. *ad Hiſtor. Ludovici S.* p. 280. MURATORII *Antiq. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 578. 832. GIANNONE,

II. Theſe conſtant wars, and the inexpreſſible calamities with which they were attended, were undoubtedly detrimental to the cauſe and progreſs of Chriſtianity. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the Chriſtian emperors, eſpecially thoſe who ruled in the eaſt, were active and aſſiduous in extirpating the remains of the ancient ſuperſtitions. THEODOSIUS the younger diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this pious and noble work, and many remarkable monuments of his zeal in this matter are ſtill preſerved [*c*]; ſuch as the laws which enjoined either the deſtruction of the heathen temples, or the dedication of them to CHRIST and his ſaints; the edicts by which he abrogated the ſacrilegious rites and ceremonies of Paganiſm, and removed from all offices and employments in the ſtate ſuch as perſevered in their attachment to the abſurdities of Polytheiſm.

The farther decline of idolatry.

This ſpirit of reformation appeared with leſs vigour in the weſtern empire. There the feaſts of Saturn and Pan, the combats of the gladiators, and other rites that were inſtituted in honour of the Pagan deities, were celebrated with the utmoſt freedom and impunity; and perſons of the higheſt rank and authority profeſſed publicly the religion of their idolatrous anceſtors [*d*]. This liberty was, however, from time to time,

GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 207. Jo. COCHLAEI *Vita Theodorici Oſtrogothorum regis*, printed in 4to in the year 1699, with the obſervations and remarks of PERINGSKIOLD.

[*c*] See the *Theodoſian Code*, tom. vi p. 327.

[*d*] See the *Saturnalia* of MACROBIUS, lib. i. p. 100. edit. Gronov. SCIPIO MAFFEI *delli Anfiteatri*, lib. i. p. 56, 57. PIERRE LE BRUN, *Hiſt. Critique des pratiques ſuperſtitieuſes*, tom. i. p. 237. And above all MONTFAUCON, *Diſſ. de moribus tempore Theodoſii M. et Arcadii*, which is to be found in Latin, in the eleventh volume of the works of St. CHRYSOSTOM, and in French, in the twentieth volume of the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, p. 197.

CENT. V. PART I.

reduced within narrower limits; and all thoſe public ſports and feſtivals, that were more peculiarly incompatible with the genius and ſanctity of the Chriſtian religion, were every where aboliſhed [*e*].

Nations converted to Chriſtianity.

III. The limits of the church continued to extend themſelves, and gained ground daily upon the idolatrous nations both in the eaſtern and weſtern empires. In the eaſt, the inhabitants of mount *Libanus* and *Antilibanus* being dreadfully infeſted with wild beaſts, implored the aſſiſtance and counſels of the famous SIMEON the Stylite, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter. SIMEON gave them for anſwer, that the only effectual method of removing this calamity was to abandon the ſuperſtitious worſhip of their anceſtors, and ſubſtitute the Chriſtian religion in its place. The docility of this people, joined to the extremities to which they were reduced, engaged them to follow the counſels of this holy man. They embraced Chriſtianity, and, in conſequence of their converſion, they had the pleaſure of ſeeing their ſavage enemies abandon their habitations; if we may believe the writers who affirm the truth of this prodigy. The ſame SIMEON, by his influence and authority, introduced the Chriſtian worſhip into a certain diſtrict of the Arabians; ſome allege, that this alſo was effected by a miracle, which to me appears ſomewhat more than doubtful [*f*]. To theſe inſtances of the progreſs of the goſpel, we may add the converſion of a conſiderable number of Jews in the iſle of *Crete*, who, finding themſelves groſsly deluded by the impious pretenſions of an impoſtor,

[*e*] ANASTASIUS prohibited, towards the concluſion of this century, the combats with the wild beaſts, and other ſhews. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 246.

[*f*] ASSEMANNI *Bibl. Orient. Vat.* tom. i. p. 246.

called

called MOSES CRETENSIS [*g*], who gave himſelf out for the MESSIAH, opened their eyes upon the truth, and embraced the Chriſtian religion of their own accord [*b*]. CENT. V. PART I.

IV. The German nations, who rent in pieces the Roman empire in the weſt, were not all converted to Chriſtianity at the ſame time. Some of them had embraced the truth before the time of their incurſion; and ſuch, among others, was the caſe of the Goths. Others, after having erected their little kingdoms in the empire, embraced the goſpel, that they might thus live with more ſecurity amidſt a people, who, in general, profeſſed the Chriſtian religion. It is, however, uncertain (and likely to continue ſo) at what time, and by whoſe miniſtry, the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans were converted to Chriſtianity. With reſpect to the Burgundians, who inhabited the banks of the *Rhine*, and who paſſed from thence into *Gaul*, we are informed, by SOCRATES [*i*], that they embraced the goſpel of their own accord, from a notion that CHRIST, or the God of the Romans, who had been repreſented to them as a moſt powerful being, would defend them againſt The converſion of the German nations to Chriſtianity.

☞ [*g*] We ſhall give the relation of SOCRATES, concerning this impoſtor, in the words of the learned and eſtimable author of the *Remarks on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*. "In the time "of THEODOSIUS the younger an impoſtor aroſe, called "MOSES CRETENSIS. He pretended to be a ſecond Mo"SES, ſent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in *Crete*, and "promiſed to divide the ſea, and give them a ſafe paſſage "through it. They aſſembled together, with their wives "and children, and followed him to a promontory. He "there commanded them to caſt themſelves into the ſea. "Many of them obeyed and periſhed in the waters, and "many were taken up and ſaved by fiſhermen. Upon this, "the deluded Jews would have torn the impoſtor to pieces; "but he eſcaped them, and was ſeen no more." See JORTIN's *Remarks*, &c. firſt edit. vol. iii. p. 331.

[*b*] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xxxviii. p. 383.

[*i*] Idem, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xxx. p. 371.

CENT. V. PART I.

the rapines and incurſions of the Huns. They afterwards ſided with the Arian party, to which alſo the Vandals, Sueves, and Goths were zealouſly attached. All theſe fierce and warlike nations judged a religion excellent, in proportion to the ſucceſs which crowned the arms of thoſe that profeſſed it, and eſteemed, conſequently, that doctrine the beſt, whoſe profeſſors had gained the greateſt number of victories. When therefore they ſaw the Romans poſſeſſed of an empire much more extenſive than that of any other people, they concluded that CHRIST, their God, was of all others the moſt worthy of religious homage.

Of the Franks.

V. It was the ſame principle and the ſame views that engaged CLOVIS [*k*], king of the *Salii*, a nation of the Franks, to embrace Chriſtianity. This prince, whoſe ſignal valour was accompanied with barbarity, arrogance, and injuſtice, founded the kingdom of the Franks in *Gaul*, after having made himſelf maſter of a great part of that country, and meditated with a ſingular eagerneſs and avidity the conqueſt of the whole. His converſion to the Chriſtian religion, is dated from the battle he fought with the Alemans in the year 496, at a village called *Tolbiacum* [*l*]; in which, when the Franks began to give ground, and their affairs ſeemed deſperate, he implored the aſſiſtance of CHRIST (whom his queen CLOTHILDIS, daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had often repreſented to him, in vain, as the *ſon* of the *true God*), and ſolemnly engaged himſelf, by a vow, to worſhip him as his God, if he rendered him victorious over his enemies. Victory decided in

[*k*] Beſides the name of CLOVIS, this prince was alſo called CLODOVÆUS, HLUDOVICUS, LUDOVICUS, and LUPICIN.

[*l*] *Tolbiacum* is thought to be the preſent *Zulpick*, which is about twelve miles from *Cologn*.

favour

favour of the Franks; and CLOVIS, faithful to his engagement, received baptiſm at *Rheims* [*m*], towards the concluſion of that ſame year, after having been inſtructed by REMIGIUS, biſhop of that city, in the doctrines of the goſpel [*n*]. The example of the king had ſuch a powerful effect upon the minds of his ſubjects, that three thouſand of them immediately followed it, and were baptized with him. Many are of opinion, that the deſire of extending his dominions was that which contributed principally to render CLOVIS faithful to his engagement; though ſome influence may alſo be allowed to the zeal and exhortations of his queen CLOTHILDIS. Be that as it will, nothing is more certain than that his profeſſion of Chriſtianity was, in effect, of great uſe to him, both in confirming and enlarging his empire. CENT. V. PART I.

The miracles, which are ſaid to have been wrought at the baptiſm of CLOVIS, are utterly unworthy of the ſmalleſt degree of credit. Among others the principal prodigy, that of the phial full of oil ſaid to be brought from heaven by a milk white dove, during the ceremony of baptiſm, is a fiction, or rather, perhaps, an impoſture; a pretended miracle contrived by artifice and fraud [*o*]. Pious frauds of this nature were very commonly practiſed in *Gaul* and in *Spain* at

☞ [*m*] See GREGORY of *Tours*, *Hiſtoria Francorum*, lib. ii. cap. XXX, XXXI. HENRY Count BUNAU's *Hiſtoria Imperii Romano-Germanici*, tom. i. p. 588. DE BOS's *Hiſtoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoiſe*, tom. ii. p. 340.

☞ [*n*] The Epitomizer of the hiſtory of the Franks tells us, that REMIGIUS having preached to CLOVIS, and thoſe who had been baptized with him, a ſermon on the paſſion of our Saviour; the king, in hearing him, could not forbear crying out, "If I had been there with my Franks, that "ſhould not have happened."

[*o*] The truth of this miracle has been denied by the learned JOHN JAMES CHIFLET, in his book *De ampulla Rhemenſi*, printed in folio, at *Antwerp*, in the year 1651; and it

CENT. V. PART I.

at this time, in order to captivate, with more facility, the minds of a rude and barbarous people, who were ſcarcely ſuſceptible of a rational conviction.

The converſion of CLOVIS is looked upon, by the learned as the origin of the titles of *Moſt Chriſtian king*, and *Eldeſt ſon of the church*, which have been ſo long attributed to the kings of *France* [p]. For if we except this prince, all the kings of thoſe barbarous nations, who ſeized upon the Roman provinces, were either yet involved in the darkneſs of paganiſm, or infected with the Arian hereſy.

Of the Iriſh.

VI. CELESTINE, the Roman pontiff, ſent PALLADIUS into *Ireland*, to propagate the Chriſtian religion among the rude inhabitants of that iſland.

has been affirmed by VERTOT, in the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. iv. p. 350. After a mature conſideration of what has been alleged on both ſides of the queſtion, I can ſcarcely venture to deny the fact: I am therefore of opinion, that, in order to confirm and fix the wavering faith of this Barbarian prince, REMIGIUS had prepared his meaſures before-hand, and trained a pigeon by vaſt application and dexterity in ſuch a manner, that, during the baptiſm of CLOVIS, it deſcended from the roof of the church with a phial of oil. Among the records of this century, we find accounts of many ſuch miracles. ☞ There is one circumſtance, which obliges me to differ from Dr. MOSHEIM upon this point, and to look upon the ſtory of the famous phial, rather as a *mere fiction*, than as a *pious fraud* or pretended miracle brought about by artifice; and that circumſtance is, that GREGORY of *Tours*, from whom we have a full account of the converſion and baptiſm of CLOVIS, and who, from his proximity to this time, may almoſt be called a contemporary writer, has not made the leaſt mention of this famous miracle. This omiſſion, in a writer whom the Roman-catholics themſelves conſider as an over-credulous hiſtorian, amounts to a proof, that, in his time, this fable was not yet invented.

[p] See GAB. DANIEL et DE CAMPS, *Diſſert. de titulo Regis Chriſtianiſſimi*, *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1720, p. 243. 336. 404. 448. *Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions*, tom. xx. p. 466.

This

This firſt miſſion [q] was not attended with much fruits; nor did the ſucceſs of PALLADIUS bear any proportion to his laborious and pious endeavours. After his death, the ſame pontiff employed, in this miſſion, SUCCATHUS, a native of *Scotland*, whoſe name he changed into that of PATRICK, and who arrived among the Iriſh in the year 432. The ſucceſs of his miniſtry, and the number and importance of his pious exploits, ſtand upon record as undoubted proofs not only of his reſolution and patience, but alſo of his dexterity and addreſs. Having attacked, with much more ſucceſs than his predeceſſor, the errors and ſuperſtitions of that uncivilized people, and brought great numbers of them over to the Chriſtian religion, he founded, in the year 472, the archbiſhopric of *Armagh* [r], which has ever ſince remained the metropolitan ſee of the Iriſh nation. Hence this famous miſſionary, though not the firſt who brought among that people the light of the Goſpel, has yet been juſtly intitled, *The apoſtle of the Iriſh*, and the father of the Hibernian

☞ [q] From the fragments of the lives of ſome Iriſh biſhops, who are ſaid to have converted many of their countrymen in the fourth century, archbiſhop USHER concludes, that PALLADIUS was not the firſt biſhop of Ireland. (See his *Antiquities of the Britiſh Church.*) But it has been evidently proved, among others by BOLLANDUS, that theſe *fragments* are of no earlier date than the twelfth century, and are, beſides, the moſt of them fabulous. Dr. MOSHEIM's opinion is further confirmed by the authority of PROSPER, which is deciſive in this matter.

[r] See the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. Martii, p. 517. tom. iii. Februar. p. 121. 179. JAC. WARAEI *Hibernia Sacra*, printed in folio at *Dublin*, 1717. This latter publiſhed at *London*, in 1656, in 8vo, *the Works of St.* PATRICK. The ſynods, that were held by this eminent miſſionary, are to be found in WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ*, tom. i. p. 2. With reſpect to the famous cave, which is called the *Purgatory of St.* PATRICK, the reader may conſult LE BRUN, *Hiſtoire Critique des pratiques ſuperſtitieuſes*, tom. iv. p. 34.

church;

CENT. V. PART I.

church; and is ſtill generally acknowledged and revered in that honourable character.

The cauſes of theſe converſions.

VII. The cauſes and circumſtances by which theſe different nations were engaged to abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors, and to embrace the religion of JESUS, may be eaſily deduced from the facts we have related in the hiſtory of their converſion. It would, indeed, be an inſtance of the blindeſt and moſt perverſe partiality, not to acknowledge, that the labours and zeal of great and eminent men contributed to this happy purpoſe, and were the means by which the darkneſs of many was turned into light. But, on the other hand, they muſt be very inattentive and ſuperficial obſervers of things, who do not perceive that the fear of puniſhment, the proſpect of honours and advantages, and the deſire of obtaining ſuccour againſt their enemies from the countenance of the Chriſtians, or the miraculous influences of their religion, were the prevailing motives that induced the greateſt part to renounce the ſervice of their impotent gods.

How far theſe converſions were due to real miracles attending the miniſtry of theſe early preachers, is a matter extremely difficult to be determined. For though I am perſuaded that thoſe pious men, who, in the midſt of many dangers, and in the face of obſtacles ſeemingly invincible, endeavoured to ſpread the light of Chriſtianity through the barbarous nations, were ſometimes accompanied with the more peculiar preſence and ſuccours of the Moſt High [s]; yet I am equally convinced, that the greateſt part of

[s] There is a remarkable paſſage, relating to the miracles of this century, in ÆNEAS GAZEUS's *Dialogue concerning the Immortality of the Soul*, &c. intitled, *Theophraſtus*, p. 78, 80, 81. edit. Barthii. See the controverſy concerning the time when miracles ceaſed in the church, that was carried on ſome years ago, on occaſion of Dr. MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry*, &c.

the

the prodigies, recorded in the hiſtories of this age, are liable to the ſtrongeſt ſuſpicions of falſehood or impoſture. The ſimplicity and ignorance of the generality in thoſe times furniſhed the moſt favourable occaſion for the exerciſe of fraud; and the impudence of impoſtors, in contriving falſe miracles, was artfully proportioned to the credulity of the vulgar [*t*]; while the ſagacious and the wiſe, who perceived theſe cheats, were obliged to ſilence by the dangers that threatened their lives and fortunes, if they detected the artifice [*u*]. Thus does it generally happen in human life, that, when the diſcovery and profeſſion of the truth is attended with danger, the prudent are *ſilent*, the multitude *believe*, and impoſtors *triumph*.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events which happened to the church during this century.

I. IT has been already obſerved, that the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, and the Vandals, with other fierce and warlike nations, for the moſt part ſtrangers to Chriſtianity, had invaded the Roman empire, and rent it aſunder in the moſt deplorable manner. Amidſt theſe calamities, the Chriſtians were grievous, nay, we may venture to ſay, the principal ſufferers. It is true, theſe ſavage nations were much more intent upon the acquiſition of wealth and dominion, The Chriſtians ſuffer in the Roman empire.

[*t*] This is ingenuouſly confeſſ'd by the Benedictine monks, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 33. and happily expreſſed by LIVY, *Hiſt.* lib. xxiv. cap. x. §6. *Prodigia multa nuntiata ſunt, quæ quo magis credebant ſimplices et religioſi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur.*

[*u*] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. p. 438. *Ep.* i. p. 457. *Dial.* iii. cap. ii. p. 487.

CENT. V. PART I.

than upon the propagation or ſupport of the Pagan ſuperſtitions; nor did their cruelty and oppoſition to the Chriſtians ariſe from any religious principle, or from an enthuſiaſtic deſire to ruin the cauſe of Chriſtianity; it was merely by the inſtigation of the Pagans, who remained yet in the empire, that they were excited to treat with ſuch ſeverity and violence the followers of CHRIST. The painful conſideration of their abrogated rites, and the hopes of recovering their former liberty and privileges by the means of their new maſters, induced the worſhipers of the gods to ſeize with avidity every opportunity of inſpiring them with the moſt bitter averſion to the Chriſtians. Their endeavours, however, were without the deſired effect, and their expectations were entirely diſappointed. The greateſt part of theſe barbarians embraced Chriſtianity; though it be alſo true, that, in the beginning of their uſurpations, the profeſſors of that religion ſuffered heavily under the rigour of their government.

The attempts of the Pagans to deſtroy their credit.

II. To deſtroy the credit of the goſpel, and to excite the hatred of the multitude againſt the Chriſtians, the Pagans took occaſion, from the calamities and tumults which diſtracted the empire, to renew the obſolete complaint of their anceſtors againſt Chriſtianity, as the ſource of theſe complicated woes. They alleged, that, before the coming of CHRIST, the world was bleſſed with peace and proſperity; but that, ſince the progreſs of his religion every where, the gods, filled with indignation to ſee their worſhip neglected and their altars abandoned, had viſited the earth with thoſe plagues and deſolations, which increaſed every day. This feeble objection was entirely removed by AUGUSTIN, in his book *Concerning the city of God*; a work extremely rich and ample in point of matter, and filled with the moſt profound and diverſified erudition. It alſo drew

a com-

a complete confutation from the learned pen of OROSIUS, who, in a hiſtory written expreſsly for that purpoſe, ſhewed, with the utmoſt evidence, that not only the ſame calamities now complained of, but alſo plagues of a much more dreadful kind, had afflicted mankind before the Chriſtian religion appeared in the world. CENT. V. PART I.

The calamities of the times produced ſtill more pernicious effects upon the religious ſentiments of the Gauls. They introduced among that people the moſt deſperate notions, and led many of them to reject the belief of a ſuperintending providence, and to exclude the deity from the government of the univerſe. Againſt theſe frenetic infidels, SALVIAN wrote his book *Concerning the divine government.*

III. Hitherto we have given only a general view of the ſufferings of the Chriſtians; it is however proper, that we enter into a more diſtinct and particular account of that matter. The perſecutions they ſuffered.

In *Gaul*, and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals, whoſe cruel and ſacrilegious ſoldiery reſpected neither the majeſty of religion nor the rights of humanity, committed acts of barbarity and violence againſt a multitude of Chriſtians.

In *Britain*, a long ſeries of tumults and diviſions involved the Chriſtians in many troubles. When the affairs of the Romans declined in that country, the Britons were tormented by the Picts and Scots, nations remarkable for their violence and ferocity. Hence, after many ſufferings and diſaſters, they choſe, in the year 445, VORTIGERN for their king. This prince, finding himſelf too weak to make head againſt the enemies of his country, called the Anglo-Saxons from *Germany* to his aid in the year 449. The conſequences of this meaſure were pernicious; and it ſoon appeared that this people, who came as auxiliaries

liaries into *Britain*, oppreſſed it with calamities more grievous than thoſe which it had ſuffered from its enemies. For the Saxons aimed at nothing leſs than to ſubdue the ancient inhabitants of the country, and to reduce the whole iſland under their dominion. Hence a moſt bloody and obſtinate war aroſe between the Britons and Saxons, which, after having been carried on, during the ſpace of an hundred and thirty years, with various ſucceſs, ended in the defeat of the Britons, who were forced to yield to the Anglo-Saxons, and to ſeek a retreat in *Batavia* and *Cambria*. During theſe commotions, the ſtate of the Britiſh church was deplorable beyond expreſſion; it was almoſt totally overwhelmed and extinguiſhed by the Anglo-Saxons, who adhered to the worſhip of the gods, and put an immenſe number of Chriſtians to the moſt cruel deaths [*w*].

In *Perſia.* IV. In *Perſia*, the Chriſtians ſuffered grievouſly by the imprudent zeal of ABDAS, biſhop of *Suza*, who pulled down the *pyræum*, which was a temple dedicated to *fire*. For when this obſtinate prelate was ordered by the king (ISDEGERDES) to rebuild that temple, he refuſed to comply; for which he was put to death in the year 414, and the churches of the Chriſtians were levelled to the ground. This perſecution was not however of long duration, but ſeems to have been extinguiſhed ſoon after its commencement.

VARARENES, the ſon of the monarch already mentioned, treated the Chriſtians in a manner yet more barbarous and inhuman in the year 421, to which he was led partly by the inſtigation of the Magi, and partly by his keen averſion to the Romans, with whom he was at war. For as often

[*w*] See, beſides BEDE and GILDA, JAC. USSER. *Antiquitat. Eccleſiæ Britannicæ*, cap. xii. p. 415. RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtoire d' Angleterre*, tom. i. livr. ii. p. 91.

as

as the Perſians and the Romans were at variance, ſo often did the Chriſtians, who dwelt in *Perſia*, feel new and redoubled effects of their monarch's wrath; and this from a prevailing notion, not perhaps entirely groundleſs, that they favoured the Romans, and rendered real ſervices to their republic [x]. In this perſecution, a prodigious number of Chriſtians periſhed in the moſt exquiſite tortures, and by various kinds of puniſhments [y]. But they were, at length, delivered from theſe cruel oppreſſions by the peace that was made in the year 427, between VARARENES and the Roman empire [z].

It was not from the Pagans only that the Chriſtians were expoſed to ſuffering and perſecution; they were moreover haraſſed and oppreſſed in a variety of ways by the Jews, who lived in great opulence, and enjoyed a high degree of favour and credit in ſeveral parts of the eaſt [a]. Among theſe none treated them with greater rigour and arrogance than GAMALIEL, the patriarch of that nation, a man of the greateſt power and influence, whoſe authority and violence were, on that account, reſtrained, in the year 415, by an expreſs and particular edict of THEODOSIUS the younger [b].

Chriſtianity oppoſed by ſecret enemies.

V. It does not appear, from any records of hiſtory now remaining, that any writings againſt CHRIST and his followers were publiſhed in this century, unleſs we conſider as ſuch the hiſtories of OLYMPIODORUS [c] and ZOSIMUS, of whom

[x] THEODORET. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. v. cap. xxix. p. 245. BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ABDAS. BARBEYRAC, *De la morale des Peres*, p. 320.

[y] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 182. 248.

[z] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xx. p. 358.

[a] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xiii. p. 349. cap. xvi. p. 353. *Codex Theodoſ.* tom. vi. p. 265.

[b] *Codex Theodoſ.* tom. vi. p. 262.

[c] PHOTIUS, *Biblioth. Cod.* lxxx. p. 178.

the

CENT. V. PART I.

the latter loſes no opportunity of reviling the Chriſtians, and loading them with the moſt unjuſt and bitter reproaches. But though the number of books written againſt Chriſtianity was ſo ſmall, yet we are not to ſuppoſe that its adverſaries had laid aſide the ſpirit of oppoſition. The ſchools of the philoſophers and rhetoricians were yet open in *Greece*, *Syria*, and *Egypt*; and there is no doubt but that theſe ſubtle teachers laboured aſſiduouſly to corrupt the minds of the youth, and to inſtil into them, at leaſt, ſome of the principles of the ancient ſuperſtition [*d*]. The hiſtory of theſe times, and the writings of ſeveral Chriſtians who lived in this century, exhibit evident proofs of theſe clandeſtine methods of oppoſing the progreſs of the goſpel.

[*d*] ZACHARIAS MITYLEN, *De opificio Dei*, p. 165. 200. edit. Barthii.

PART

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of learning and philoſophy.

I. THOUGH, in this century, the illiterate and ignorant were advanced to eminent and important ſtations, both eccleſiaſtical and civil, yet we muſt not conclude from thence, that the ſciences were held in univerſal contempt. The value of learning, and the excellence of the *finer arts*, were yet generally acknowledged among the thinking part of mankind. Hence public ſchools were erected in almoſt all the great cities, ſuch as *Conſtantinople*, *Rome*, *Marſeilles*, *Edeſſa*, *Niſibis*, *Carthage*, *Lyons*, and *Treves*; and public inſtructors of capacity and genius were ſet apart for the education of the youth, and maintained at the expence of the emperors. Several biſhops and monks contributed alſo to the advancement of knowledge, by imparting to others their ſmall ſtock of learning and ſcience. But the infelicity of the times, the incurſions of the barbarous nations, and the ſcarcity of great geniuſes, rendered the fruits of theſe excellent eſtabliſhments much leſs than their generous founders and promoters expected. The ſtate of letters among the Chriſtians.

II. In the weſtern provinces, and eſpecially in *Gaul*, there were indeed ſome men eminently diſtinguiſhed by their learning and talents, and every way proper to ſerve as models to the lower orders in the republic of letters. Of this we have abundant proof from the writings of MACROBIUS, In the weſt.

CENT. V. PART II.

SALVIAN, VINCENTIUS, biſhop of *Liris*, ENNODIUS, SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, CLAUDIAN, MAMERTUS, DRACONTIUS, and others, who, though in ſome reſpects inferior to the more celebrated authors of antiquity, are yet far from being deſtitute of elegance, and diſcover in their productions a moſt laborious application to literary reſearches of various kinds. But the barbarous nations, which either ſpread deſolation, or formed ſettlements in the Roman territories, choked the growth of thoſe genial ſeeds, which the hand of ſcience had ſowed in more auſpicious times. Theſe ſavage invaders, poſſeſſed of no other ambition than that of conqueſt, and looking upon military courage as the only ſource of true virtue and ſolid glory, beheld of conſequence the arts and ſciences with the utmoſt contempt. Wherever therefore they extended their conqueſts, ignorance and darkneſs followed their ſteps, and the culture of the ſciences was confined to the prieſts and monks alone. And, even among theſe, learning degenerated from its primitive luſtre, and put on the moſt unſeemly and fantaſtic form. Amidſt the ſeduction of corrupt examples, the alarms of perpetual danger, and the horrors and devaſtations of war, the Sacerdotal and Monaſtic orders loſt gradually all taſte for ſolid ſcience, in the place of which they ſubſtituted a lifeleſs ſpectre, an enormous phantom of barbarous erudition. They indeed kept public ſchools, and inſtructed the youth in, what they called, the *Seven liberal arts* [*d*]; but theſe, as we learn from AUGUSTIN's account of them, conſiſted only of a certain number of dry, ſubtile, and uſeleſs precepts; and were conſequently more adapted to load and perplex the memory, than to

☞ [*d*] Theſe *ſeven* liberal *arts* were *grammar*, *rhetoric*, *logic*, *arithmetic*, *muſic*, *geometry*, and *aſtronomy*. See Cent. VIII. Part II. Ch. II. in this volume.

improve

improve and ſtrengthen the judgment. So that, towards the concluſion of this century, the ſciences were almoſt totally extinguiſhed; at leaſt, what remained of them was no more than a ſhadowy form, without either ſolidity or conſiſtence.

The ſtate of philoſophy in the weſt.

III. The few that applied themſelves to the ſtudy of philoſophy in this age, had not, as yet, embraced the doctrine or method of ARISTOTLE. They looked upon the ſyſtem of this eminent philoſopher, as a labyrinth beſet with thorns and thiſtles [*e*]; and yet, had they been able to read and underſtand his works, it is probable, that many of them would have become his followers. The doctrine of PLATO had a more eſtabliſhed reputation, which it had enjoyed for ſeveral ages, and was conſidered not only as leſs ſubtile and difficult than that of the Stagirite, but alſo as more conformable to the genius and ſpirit of the Chriſtian religion. Beſides, the moſt valuable of Plato's works were tranſlated into Latin by VICTORINUS, and were thus adapted to general uſe [*f*]. And SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS [*g*] informs us, that all thoſe, among the Latins, who had any inclination to the ſtudy of truth, fell into the Platonic notions, and followed that ſage as their philoſophical guide.

In the eaſt.

IV. The fate of learning was leſs deplorable among the Greeks and Orientals, than in the weſtern provinces; and not only the ſeveral branches of polite literature, but alſo the more ſolid and profound ſciences, were cultivated by them with tolerable ſucceſs. Hence we find among them more writers of genius and learning than in other

[*e*] The paſſages of different writers, that prove what is here advanced, are collected by LAUNOIUS, in his book, *De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna in Academia Pariſienſi.*

[*f*] See AUGUSTINI *Confeſſionum*, lib. i. cap. ii. § i. p. 105, 106. tom. i. opp.

[*g*] See his *Epiſtles*, book iv. ep. iii. xi. book ix. ep. ix.

CENT. V. PART II.

countries. Thoſe, who inclined to the ſtudy of law, reſorted generally to *Berytus*, famous for its learned academy [*b*], or to *Alexandria* [*i*], which latter city was frequented by the ſtudents of phyſic and chemiſtry. The profeſſors of eloquence, poetry, philoſophy, and the other liberal arts, taught the youth in public ſchools, which were erected in almoſt every city. Thoſe however of *Alexandria*, *Conſtantinople*, and *Edeſſa*, were looked upon as ſuperior to all others, both in point of erudition and method [*k*].

Modern Platonics.

V. The doctrine and ſect of the modern Platonics retained as yet, among the Syrians and Alexandrians, a conſiderable part of their ancient ſplendor. OLYMPIODORUS, HERO [*l*], and other philoſophers of the firſt rank, added a luſtre to the Alexandrian ſchool. That of *Athens* was rendered famous by the talents and erudition of THEOPHRASTUS, PLUTARCH, and his ſucceſſor SYRIAN. Theſe were the inſtructors of the renouned PROCLUS, who far ſurpaſſed the Platonic philoſophers of this century, and acquired ſuch a high degree of the public eſteem, as enabled him to give new life to the doctrine of PLATO, and reſtore it to its former credit in *Greece* [*m*]. MARINUS of *Neapolis*, AMMONIUS the ſon of HERMIAS, ISIDORUS and DAMASCIUS, the diſciples of PROCLUS, followed, with an ardent emulation, the traces of their maſter, and formed ſucceſſors that reſembled them in all reſpects. But the imperial laws, and the daily progreſs of the Chriſ-

[*b*] See HASÆI *Libr. de Academia Jureconſultorum Berytenſi*; as alſo MITYLENÆUS, *De opificio Dei*, p. 164.

[*i*] ZACH. MITYLENÆUS, *De opificio Dei*, p. 179.

[*k*] ÆNEAS GAZÆUS *in Theophraſto*, p. 6, 7, 16, &c.

[*l*] MARINUS, *vita Procli*, cap. ix. p. 19. edit. Fabricii.

[*m*] The life of PROCLUS, written by MARINUS, was publiſhed in 4to at *Hamburg*, in the year 1700, by JOHN ALBERT FABRICIUS, and was enriched, by this famous editor, with a great number of learned obſervations.

tian

tian religion, gradually diminiſhed the luſtre and authority of theſe philoſophers [*n*]. And as there were many of the Chriſtian doctors who adopted the Platonic ſyſtem, and were ſufficiently qualified to explain it to the youth, this hindered, naturally, the ſchools of theſe heathen ſages from being ſo much frequented as they had formerly been.

The philoſophy of Ariſtotle riſes into credit.

VI. The credit of the Platonic philoſophy, and the preference that was given to it, as more excellent in itſelf, and leſs repugnant to the genius of the goſpel than other ſyſtems, did not prevent the doctrine of ARISTOTLE from coming to light after a long ſtruggle, and forcing its way into the Chriſtian church. The Platonics themſelves interpreted, in their ſchools, ſome of the writings of ARISTOTLE, particularly his Dialectics, and recommended that work to ſuch of the youth as had a taſte for logical diſcuſſions, and were fond of diſputing. In this, the Chriſtian doctors imitated the manner of the heathen ſchools; and this was the firſt ſtep to that univerſal dominion, which the Stagirite afterward obtained in the republic of letters A ſecond, and a yet larger ſtride, which the Ariſtotelian philoſophy made towards this univerſal empire, was, during the controverſies which ORIGEN had occaſioned, and the Arian, Eutychian, Neſtorian, and Pelagian diſſenſions, which, in this century, were ſo fruitful of calamities to the Chriſtian church. ORIGEN, as is well known, was zealouſly attached to the Platonic ſyſtem. When therefore he was publicly condemned, many, to avoid the imputation of his errors, and to prevent their being counted among the number of his followers, adopted openly the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, which was

[*n*] See ÆNEAS GAZÆUS *in Theophraſto*, p. 6, 7, 8. 13. edit. Barthii.

CENT. V. PART II.

entirely different from that of ORIGEN. The Neſtorian, Arian, and Eutychian controverſies were managed, or rather drawn out, on both ſides, by a perpetual recourſe to ſubtle diſtinctions, and captious ſophiſms. And no philoſophy was ſo proper to furniſh ſuch weapons, as that of ARISTOTLE; for that of PLATO was far from being adapted to form the mind to the Polemic arts. Beſides, the Pelagian doctrine bore a ſtriking reſemblance of the Platonic opinions concerning God and the human ſoul; and this was an additional reaſon which engaged many to deſert the Platoniſts, and to aſſume, at leaſt, the name of Peripatetics.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the chriſtian church, and its form of government.

The external form of church government ſomewhat changed.

I. SEVERAL cauſes contributed to bring about a change in the external form of eccleſiaſtical government. The power of the biſhops, particularly thoſe of the firſt order, was ſometimes augmented, and ſometimes diminiſhed; according as the times and the occaſions offered; and in all theſe changes the intrigues of the court and the political ſtate of the empire had much more influence, than the rules of equity and wiſdom.

Theſe alterations were, indeed, matters of ſmall moment. But an affair of much greater conſequence drew now the general attention, and this was the vaſt augmentation of honours and rank that was at this time accumulated upon the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, in oppoſition to the moſt vigorous efforts of the Roman pontif. In the preceding century, the council of *Conſtantinople* had, on account of the dignity and privileges of

that

that imperial city, conferred upon its biſhops a place among the firſt rulers of the Chriſtian church. This new dignity adding fuel to their ambition, they extended their views of authority and dominion, and encouraged, no doubt, by the conſent of the emperor, reduced the provinces of *Aſia*, *Thrace*, and *Pontus* under their ghoſtly juriſdiction. In this century, they graſped at ſtill further acceſſions of power; ſo that not only the whole eaſtern part of *Illyricum* was added to their former acquiſitions, but they were alſo exalted to the higheſt ſummit of eccleſiaſtical authority. For, by the XXVIIIth *Canon* of the council held at *Chalcedon* in the year 451, it was reſolved, that the ſame rights and honours, which had been conferred upon the biſhop of *Rome*, were due to the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, on account of the equal dignity and luſtre of the two cities, in which theſe prelates exerciſed their authority. The ſame council confirmed alſo, by a ſolemn act, the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in the ſpiritual government of thoſe provinces over which he had ambitiouſly uſurped the juriſdiction. LEO the GREAT, biſhop of *Rome*, oppoſed, with vehemence, the paſſing of theſe decrees, and his oppoſition was ſeconded by that of ſeveral other prelates. But their efforts were vain, as the emperors threw in their weight into the balance, and thus ſupported the deciſions of the Grecian biſhops [*o*]. In conſequence then of the decrees of this famous council, the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* began to contend obſtinately for the ſupremacy with the Roman pontif, and to cruſh the biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, ſo as to make them feel the oppreſſive effects of his pretended ſuperiority. And none diſtinguiſhed himſelf more by his ambition and arrogance in this

[*o*] LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſt.* tom. i. p. 36.

CENT. V. PART II.

matter, than ACACIUS, one of the biſhops of that imperial city [*p*].

The ambition of Juvenal.

II. It was much about this time that JUVENAL, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, or rather of *Ælia*, attempted to withdraw himſelf and his church from the juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and aſpired after a place among the firſt prelates of the Chriſtian world. The high degree of veneration and eſteem, in which the church of *Jeruſalem* was held among all other Chriſtian ſocieties (on account of its rank among the apoſtolical churches, and its title to the appellation of *mother-church*, as having ſucceeded the firſt Chriſtian aſſembly founded by the apoſtles), was extremely favourable to the ambition of JUVENAL, and rendered his project much more practicable, than it would otherwiſe have been. Encouraged by this, and animated by the favour and protection of THEODOSIUS the younger, the aſpiring prelate not only aſſumed the dignity of patriarch of all *Paleſtine* [*q*], a rank that rendered him ſupreme and independent of all ſpiritual authority, but alſo invaded the rights of the biſhop of *Antioch*, and uſurped his juriſdiction over the provinces of *Phœnicia* and *Arabia*. Hence there aroſe a warm conteſt between JUVENAL and MAXIMUS biſhop of *Antioch*,

[*p*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary* in Engliſh, at the article ACACIUS.

☞ [*q*] By *All Paleſtine*, the reader is deſired to underſtand three diſtinct provinces, of which each bore the name of *Paleſtine*, and accordingly the original is thus expreſſed, *Trium Palæſtinarum Epiſcopum ſeu Patriarcham*. After the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, the face of *Paleſtine* was almoſt totally changed; and it was ſo parcelled out and waſted by a ſucceſſion of wars and invaſions, that it preſerved ſcarcely any trace of its former condition. Under the Chriſtian emperors there were *Three Paleſtines* formed out of the ancient country of that name, each of which was an epiſcopal ſee. And it was of theſe three dioceſes that JUVENAL uſurped and maintained the juriſdiction. See, for a further account of the *Three Paleſtines*, SPANHEMII *Geographia Sacra*, opp. tom. i. p. 79.

which

which the council of *Chalcedon* decided, by reſtoring to the latter the provinces of *Phœnicia* and *Arabia*, and confirming the former in the ſpiritual poſſeſſion of all *Paleſtine* [r], and in the high rank which he had aſſumed in the church [s]. By this means, there were created, in this century, five ſuperior rulers of the church, who were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt, by the title of Patriarchs [t]. The oriental hiſtorians mention a ſixth, *viz.* The biſhop of *Seleucia* and *Cteſiphon*, to whom, according to their account, the biſhop of *Antioch* voluntarily ceded a part of his juriſdiction [u]. But this addition to the number of the patriarchs is unworthy of credit, as the only proof of it is drawn from the Arabic *laws* of the council of *Nice*, which are notoriouſly deſtitute of all authority.

The rights and privileges of the patriarchs.

III. The patriarchs were diſtinguiſhed by conſiderable and extenſive rights and privileges, that were annexed to their high ſtation. They alone conſecrated the biſhops, who lived in the provinces that belonged to their juriſdiction. They aſſembled yearly in council the clergy of their reſpective diſtricts, in order to regulate the affairs of the church. The cognizance of all important cauſes, and the determination of the more weighty controverſies, were referred to the patriarch of the province where they aroſe. They alſo pronounced a deciſive judgment in thoſe caſes, where accuſations were brought againſt biſhops. And,

[r] See alſo, for an account of the *Three Paleſtines*, CAROLI à S. PAULO *Geographia Sacra*, p. 307.

[s] See MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 110.

[t] See the authors who have written concerning the Patriarchs, which are mentioned and recommended by the learned FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. xiii. p. 453.

[u] ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican*, tom. i. p. 9-13, &c.

laſtly,

laſtly, they appointed *vicars* [w], or deputies, cloathed with their authority, for the preſervation of order and tranquillity in the remoter provinces. Such were the great and diſtinguiſhing privileges of the patriarchs; and they were accompanied with others of leſs moment, which it is needleſs to mention.

It muſt, however, be carefully obſerved, that the authority of the patriarchs was not acknowledged through all the provinces without exception. Several diſtricts, both in the eaſtern and weſtern empires, were exempted from their juriſdiction [x]. The emperors, who reſerved to themſelves the *ſupreme* power in the Chriſtian hierarchy, and received, with great facility and readineſs, the complaints of thoſe who conſidered themſelves as injured by the patriarchs; the councils alſo, in which the majeſty and legiſlative power of the church immediately reſided; all theſe were ſo many obſtacles to the arbitrary proceedings of the patriarchal order.

The inconveniencies that accompanied the patriarchal authority and government.

IV. This conſtitution of eccleſiaſtical government was ſo far from contributing to the peace and proſperity of the Chriſtian church, that it proved, on the contrary, a perpetual ſource of diſſenſions and animoſities, and was productive of various inconveniencies and grievances. The patriarchs, who, by their exalted rank and extenſive authority, were equally able to do much good and much miſchief, began to encroach upon the rights, and to trample upon the prerogatives of their biſhops, and thus introduced, gradually, a

[w] DAV. BLONDEL. *De la Primauté de l'Egliſe*, ch. xxv. p. 332. THEOD. RUINART, *De pallio Archi-Epiſcopali*, p. 445. tom. ii. of the poſthumous works of MABILLON.

[x] EDWARD. BREREWODIUS, *Diſſert. de veteris Eccleſiæ gubernatione Patriarchali*; which is printed at the end of archbiſhop USHER's book, intitled, *Opuſculum de origine Epiſcoporum et Metropolitan.*

ſort

ſort of ſpiritual bondage into the church. And that they might invade, without oppoſition, the rights of the biſhops, they permitted the biſhops, in their turn, to trample, with impunity, upon the ancient rights and privileges of the people. For, in proportion as the biſhops multiplied their privileges and extended their uſurpations, the patriarchs gained new acceſſions of power by the deſpotiſm which they exerciſed over the epiſcopal order. They fomented alſo diviſions among the biſhops, and excited animoſities between the biſhops and the other miniſters of the church; nay, they went ſtill further, and ſowed the ſeeds of diſcord between the clergy and the people, that all theſe combuſtions might furniſh them with perpetual matter for the exerciſe of their authority, and procure them a multitude of clients and dependants. They left no artifice unemployed to ſtrengthen their own authority, and to raiſe oppoſition againſt the biſhops from every quarter. For this purpoſe it was, that they engaged in their cauſe by the moſt alluring promiſes, and attached to their intereſts by the moſt magnificent acts of liberality, whole ſwarms of monks, who ſerved as inteſtine enemies to the biſhops, and as a dead weight on the ſide of patriarchal tyranny. Theſe monaſtic hirelings contributed more than any thing elſe, to ruin the ancient eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, to diminiſh the authority of the biſhops, and raiſe, to an enormous and exceſſive height, the power and prerogatives of their inſolent and ambitious patrons.

The contentions of the patriarchs.

V. To theſe lamentable evils were added the ambitious quarrels, and the bitter animoſities, that roſe among the patriarchs themſelves, and which produced the moſt bloody wars, and the moſt deteſtable and horrid crimes. The patriarch of *Conſtantinople* diſtinguiſhed himſelf in theſe odious conteſts. Elated with the favour and proximity

CENT. V. PART II.

imity of the imperial court, he caſt a haughty eye on all ſides, where any objects were to be found, on which he might exerciſe his lordly ambition. On the one hand, he reduced, under his juriſdiction, the patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, as prelates only of the ſecond order; and on the other, he invaded the dioceſe of the Roman pontif, and ſpoiled him of ſeveral provinces. The two former prelates, though they ſtruggled with vehemence, and raiſed conſiderable tumults by their oppoſition, yet they ſtruggled ineffectually, both for want of ſtrength, and likewiſe on account of a variety of unfavourable circumſtances. But the Roman pontif, far ſuperior to them in wealth and power, contended alſo with more vigour and obſtinacy, and, in his turn, gave a deadly wound to the uſurped ſupremacy of the Byzantine patriarch.

The attentive inquirer into the affairs of the church, from this period, will find, in the events now mentioned, the principal ſource of thoſe moſt ſcandalous and deplorable diſſenſions, which divided, firſt, the eaſtern church into various ſects, and afterwards ſeparated it entirely from that of the weſt. He will find, that theſe ignominious ſchiſms flowed chiefly from the unchriſtian contentions for dominion and ſupremacy, which reigned among thoſe who ſet themſelves up for the fathers and defenders of the church.

The power of the biſhop of *Rome.*

VI. None of the contending biſhops found the occurrences of the times ſo favourable to his ambition, as the Roman pontif. Notwithſtanding the redoubled efforts of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, a variety of circumſtances united in augmenting his power and authority, though he had not, as yet, aſſumed the dignity of ſupreme lawgiver and judge of the whole Chriſtian church. The biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, unable to make head againſt the lordly prelate of *Conſtantinople*,

Conſtantinople, fled often to the Roman pontif for ſuccour againſt his violence; and the inferior order of biſhops uſed the ſame method, when their rights were invaded by the prelates of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. So that the biſhop of *Rome*, by taking all theſe prelates alternately under his protection, daily added new degrees of influence and authority to the Roman ſee, rendered it every where reſpected, and was thus imperceptibly eſtabliſhing its ſupremacy. Such were the means by which the Roman pontif extended his dominion in the eaſt. In the weſt its increaſe was owing to other cauſes. The declining power and the ſupine indolence of the emperors, left the authority of the biſhop who preſided in their imperial city almoſt without controul. The incurſions, moreover, and triumphs of the Barbarians were ſo far from being prejudicial to his riſing dominion, that they rather contributed to its advancement. For the kings, who penetrated into the empire, were only ſolicitous about the methods of giving a ſufficient degree of ſtability to their reſpective governments. And when they perceived the ſubjection of the multitude to the biſhops, and the dependance of the biſhops upon the Roman pontif, they immediately reſolved to reconcile this ghoſtly ruler to their intereſts, by loading him with benefits and honours of various kinds. CENT. V. PART I

Among all the prelates who ruled the church of *Rome* during this century, there was none who aſſerted, with ſuch vigour and ſucceſs, the authority and pretenſions of the Roman pontif, as LEO, commonly ſurnamed the GREAT. It muſt be, however, obſerved, that neither he, nor the other promoters of that cauſe, were able to overcome all the obſtacles that were laid in their way, nor the various checks which were given to their ambition. Many examples might be alleged in proof

proof of this point, particularly the caſe of the Africans, whom no threats nor promiſes could engage to ſubmit the deciſion of their controverſies, and the determination of their cauſes, to the Roman tribunal [*y*].

The vices of the clergy.

VII. The vices of the clergy were now carried to the moſt enormous lengths; and all the writers of this century, whoſe probity and virtue render them worthy of credit, are unanimous in their accounts of the luxury, arrogance, avarice, and voluptuouſneſs of the ſacerdotal orders. The *biſhops*, and particularly thoſe of the firſt rank, created various delegates, or miniſters who managed for them the affairs of their dioceſes, and a ſort of courts were gradually formed, where theſe pompous eccleſiaſtics gave audience, and received the homage of a cringing multitude. The office of a *preſbyter* was looked upon of ſuch a high and eminent nature, that MARTIN, biſhop of *Tours*, was ſo audacious as to maintain, at a public entertainment, that the emperor was inferior, in dignity, to one of that order [*z*]. As to the *deacons*, their pride and licentiouſneſs occaſioned many and grievous complaints, as appears from the decrees of ſeveral councils [*a*].

Theſe opprobrious ſtains, in the characters of the clergy, would never have been endured, had not the greateſt part of mankind been ſunk in ſuperſtition and ignorance, and all in general formed their ideas of the rights and liberties of Chriſtian miniſters from the model exhibited by the ſacerdotal orders among the Hebrews, the

[*y*] LUD. EL. DU PIN, *De antiqua Eccleſiæ Diſciplina, Diſſ.* ii. p. 166. MELCH. LEYDECKERI, *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Africanæ*, tom. ii. *Diſſ.* ii. p. 505.

[*z*] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *De vita Martini*, cap. xx. p. 339. compared with *Dialog.* ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

[*a*] See DAV. BLONDEL. *Apologia pro ſententia Hieronymi de epiſcopis et preſbyteris*, p. 140.

Greeks,

Greeks, and Romans, during the law of MOSES, and the darkneſs of paganiſm. The barbarous nations alſo, thoſe fierce and warlike Germans, who, after the defeat of the Romans, divided among them the weſtern empire, bore, with the utmoſt patience and moderation, both the dominion and vices of the biſhops and prieſts, becauſe, upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, they became naturally ſubject to their juriſdiction; and ſtill more, becauſe they looked upon the miniſters of CHRIST as inveſted with the ſame rights and privileges, which diſtinguiſhed the prieſts of their fictitious deities.

VIII. The corruption of that order, who were appointed to promote, by their doctrine and examples, the ſacred intereſts of piety and virtue, will appear leſs ſurpriſing when we conſider, that multitudes of people of all kinds were every where admitted, without examination and without choice, into the body of the clergy, the greateſt part of whom had no other view, than the enjoyment of a lazy and inglorious repoſe. Many of theſe eccleſiaſtics were confined to no fixed places or aſſemblies, had no employment of any kind, but ſauntered about wherever they pleaſed, gaining their maintenance by impoſing upon the ignorant multitude, and ſometimes by mean and diſhoneſt practices.

The ſources from whence proceeded the vices of the clergy.

But if any ſhould aſk, how this account is reconcileable with the number of ſaints, who, according to the teſtimonies of both the eaſtern and weſtern writers, are ſaid to have ſhone forth in this century? The anſwer is obvious; theſe ſaints were canonized by the ignorance of the times. For, in an age of darkneſs and corruption, thoſe who diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the multitude, either by their genius, their writings, or their eloquence, by their prudence and dexterity in managing matters of importance, or by their meekneſs

meekneſs and moderation, and the aſcendant they had gained over their reſentments and paſſions; all ſuch were eſteemed ſomething more than men; they were reverenced as gods; or, to ſpeak more properly, they appeared to others as men divinely inſpired, and full of the deity.

The monks.

IX. The monks, who had formerly lived only for themſelves in ſolitary retreats, and had never thought of aſſuming any rank among the ſacerdotal order, were now gradually diſtinguiſhed from the populace, and were endowed with ſuch opulence and ſuch honourable privileges, that they found themſelves in a condition to claim an eminent ſtation among the ſupports and pillars of the Chriſtian community [*b*]. The fame of their piety and ſanctity was at firſt ſo great, that biſhops and preſbyters were often choſen out of their order [*c*], and the paſſion of erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might ſerve God in the moſt commodious manner, was at this time carried beyond all bounds [*d*].

The Monaſtic orders did not all obſerve the ſame rule of diſcipline, nor the ſame manner of living. Some followed the rule of AUGUSTINE, others that of BASIL, others that of ANTONY, others that of ATHANASIUS, others that of PACHOMIUS; but they muſt all have become extremely negligent and remiſs in obſerving the laws of their reſpective orders, ſince the licentiouſneſs of the monks, even in this century, was

[*b*] EPIPHANIUS, *Expoſit. fidei*, tom. i. opp. p. 1094. MABILLON, *Reponſe aux Chanoines Regulieres*, tom. ii. of his poſthumous works, p. 115.

[*c*] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *De vita Martini*, cap. x. p. 320. *Dial.* i. cap. xxi. p. 426.

[*d*] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. p. 419. NORISIUS, *Hiſtor. Pelag.* lib. i. cap. iii. p. 273. tom. i. opp. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 35.

become

become a proverb [*e*], and they are ſaid to have excited the moſt dreadful tumults and ſeditions in various places. All the Monaſtic orders of all ſorts were under the protection of the biſhops in whoſe provinces they lived, nor did the patriarchs claim any authority over them, as appears with the utmoſt evidence from the decrees of the councils held in this century [*f*]. CENT. V. PART I.

X. Several writers of conſiderable merit adorned this century. Among the Greeks and Orientals, the firſt place is due to CYRIL, biſhop of *Alexandria*, ſo famous for his learned productions, and the various controverſies in which he was engaged. It would be unjuſt to derogate from the praiſes which are due to this eminent man: but it would betray, on the other hand, a criminal partiality, did we paſs uncenſured the turbulent ſpirit, the litigious and contentious temper, and the other defects, which are laid to his charge [*g*]. Greek writers.

After CYRIL, we may place THEODORET, biſhop of *Cyrus*, an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, eminent for his acquaintance with all the branches of ſacred erudition, but unfortunate in his attachment to ſome of the Neſtorian errors [*h*].

[*e*] SULP. SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. cap. viii. p. 399.

[*f*] See Jo. LAUNOII *Inquiſitio in chartam immunitatis B. Germani*, opp. tom. iii. part II. p. 3. In the ancient records, poſterior to this century, the monks are frequently called Clerks. (See MABILLON. *Præf. ad Sæc.* ii. *Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti*, p. 14.) And this ſhews, that they now began to be ranked among the *clergy*, or miniſters, of the church.

[*g*] The works of CYRIL, in ſix volumes folio, were publiſhed at *Paris*, by AUBERT, in the year 1638.

[*h*] The Jeſuit SIRMOND gave at *Paris*, in the year 1642, a noble edition of the works of this prelate in four volumes in folio; a fifth was added by GARNIER, in 1685. ☞ We muſt obſerve, in favour of this excellent eccleſiaſtic, ſo renowned for the ſanctity and ſimplicity of his manners, that he abandoned the doctrines of NESTORIUS, and thus effaced the ſtain he had contracted by his perſonal attachment to that heretic, and to JOHN of *Antioch*.

ISIDORE of *Peluſium* was a man of uncommon learning and ſanctity. A great number [*i*] of his epiſtles are yet extant, and diſcover more piety, genius, erudition, and wiſdom, than are to be found in the voluminous productions of many other writers [*k*].

THEOPHILUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, few of whoſe writings are now extant, acquired an immortal name by his violent oppoſition to ORIGEN, and his followers [*l*].

PALLADIUS deſerves a rank among the better ſort of authors, by his *Lauſiac hiſtory*, and his *Life of* CHRYSOSTOM.

THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, though accuſed after his death of the greateſt errors, was one of the moſt learned men of his time. Thoſe who have read, with any attention, the fragments of his writings, which are to be found in PHOTIUS, will lament the want of theſe excellent compoſitions, which are either entirely loſt, or, if any remain [*m*], are only extant among the Neſtorians, and that in the Syriac language [*n*].

☞ [*i*] The number of theſe *Epiſtles* amounts to 2012, which are divided into five books. They are ſhort, but admirably written, and are equally recommendable for the ſolidity of the matter, and the purity and elegance of their ſtyle.

[*k*] The beſt edition of ISIDORE's *Epiſtles*, is that which was publiſhed in folio, by the Jeſuit SCOTT, at *Paris*, in 1638.

[*l*] See EUSEB. RENAUDOTUS, *Hiſtoria Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103.

[*m*] See Jos. SIMON ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic.* tom. iii. part ii. p. 227.

☞ [*n*] It appears, by this account of the works of THEODORE, that Dr. MOSHEIM had not ſeen the *Diſſertations* of the late DUKE OF ORLEANS, in one of which, that learned prince has demonſtrated that the *Commentary upon the Pſalms*, which is to be found in the *Chain* or *Collection of Corderius*, and which bears the name of THEODORE, is the production of THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*. There exiſts, alſo, beſides the fragments that are to be found in PHOTIUS, a manuſcript commentary of this illuſtrious author upon the XII minor Prophets.

NILUS,

NILUS, diſciple of CHRYSOSTOM, compoſed ſeveral treatiſes of a practical and pious kind; but theſe performances derive more merit from the worthy and laudable intention of their author than from any other circumſtance.

We paſs over in ſilence BASILIUS of *Seleucia*; THEODOTUS of *Ancyra*; and GELASIUS of *Cyzicum*, for the ſake of brevity.

The Latin writers.

XI. A Roman pontif, LEO I, ſurnamed the GREAT, ſhines forth at the head of the Latin writers of this century. He was a man of uncommon genius and eloquence, which he employed however too much in extending his authority; a point in which his ambition was both indefatigable and exceſſive [*o*].

OROSIUS acquired a conſiderable degree of reputation by the *Hiſtory* he wrote to refute the cavils of the Pagans againſt Chriſtianity, and by his books againſt the Pelagians and Priſcillianiſts [*p*].

CASSIAN, an illiterate and ſuperſtitious man, inculcated in *Gaul*, both by his diſcourſe and his writings, the diſcipline and manner of living which prevailed among the Syrian and Egyptian monks, and was a ſort of teacher to thoſe who were called Semi-pelagians [*q*].

MAXIMUS of *Turin* publiſhed ſeveral *Homilies*, which are yet extant; and, though ſhort, are,

[*o*] All the works of LEO were publiſhed at *Lyons*, in two volumes folio, in the year 1700, by the care of the celebrated QUENEL of the Oratory.

[*p*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article OROSIUS. A valuable edition of this author, enriched with ancient coins and medals, was publiſhed in 4to, at *Leyden*, in the year 1738, by the learned HAVERCAMP.

[*q*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 215. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſiaſtique par* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 156. The works of CASSIAN were publiſhed in folio at *Francfort*, in the year 1722, with a large Commentary by ALARDUS GAZÆUS.

for the moſt part, recommendable both for their elegance and piety.

EUCHERIUS of *Lyons*, and biſhop of that city, was one of the moſt conſiderable moral writers that flouriſhed among the Latins in this century [*r*].

PONTIUS of *Nola* [*s*], diſtinguiſhed by his eminent and fervent piety, is alſo eſteemed for his poems and other good performances.

PETER, biſhop of *Ravenna*, obtained, by his eloquence, the title of *Chryſologus*; nor are his diſcourſes entirely deſtitute of genius [*t*].

SALVIAN was an eloquent, but, at the ſame time, a melancholy and ſour writer, who, in his vehement declamations againſt the vices of his times, unwarily diſcovers the defects of his own character [*u*].

[*r*] See a large account of this prelate, in the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la-France*, tom. ii. p. 275.

☞ [*s*] This pious and ingenious eccleſiaſtic is more generally known by the name of PAULIN. See *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 179. The beſt edition of his works is that publiſhed by LE BRUN, at *Paris*, in the year 1685, in two volumes 4to.

[*t*] AGNELLI *Liber Pontificalis Eccleſiæ Ravennatenſis*, tom. i. p. 321.

[*u*] *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. ii. p. 517. ☞ The authors of the hiſtory, here referred to, give a different account of SALVIAN's character. They acknowledge, that his declamations againſt the vices of the age, in his *Treatiſe againſt Avarice*, and his *Diſcourſe concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement; but they repreſent him notwithſtanding as one of the moſt humane and benevolent men of his time. It is however beyond all doubt, that he was extravagantly auſtere in the rules he preſcribed for the conduct of life. For what is more unnatural than to recommend to Chriſtians, as a neceſſary *condition* of ſalvation, the leaving their whole ſubſtance to the poor, to the utter ruin of their children and relations? It muſt however be confeſſed, that his auſterity in point of diſcipline was accompanied with the moſt amiable moderation towards thoſe who differed from him in articles of faith. There is a moſt remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe, in his *Treatiſe concerning Providence*, book v. p. 100.

PROSPER

PROSPER of *Aquitain* and MARIUS MERCATOR are abundantly known to ſuch as have employed any part of their time and attention in the ſtudy of the Pelagian diſputes, and the other controverſies that were managed in this century.

VINCENT of *Lerins* gained a laſting reputation by his ſhort, but excellent, treatiſe againſt the ſects, intitled *Commonitorium* [*w*].

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, a tumid writer, though not entirely deſtitute of eloquence; VIGILIUS of *Tapſus*; ARNOBIUS the younger, who wrote a commentary on the book of Pſalms; DRACONTIUS, and others of that claſs, are of too little conſequence to deſerve a more particular notice.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church during this century.

I. MANY points of religion were more largely explained, and many of its doctrines determined with more accuracy and preciſion, than they had been in the preceding ages. This was owing to the controverſies that were multiplied, at this time, throughout the Chriſtian world, concerning the *perſon and nature of* CHRIST; the *innate corruption and depravity of man*; the *natural ability of men to live according to*

Many points of religion determined.

☞ [*w*] This work of VINCENT, which is commended by our author, ſeems ſcarcely worthy of ſuch applauſe. I ſee nothing in it, but that blind veneration for ancient opinions, which is ſo fatal to the diſcovery and progreſs of truth, and an attempt to prove that nothing but the voice of tradition is to be conſulted in fixing the ſenſe of the Holy Scriptures. An ample account of VINCENT, PROSPER, and ARNOBIUS, is to be found in the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 305. 342. 369.

CENT. V. PART II.

the dictates of the divine law; the *neceſſity of the divine grace in order to ſalvation*; the *nature and exiſtence of human liberty*; and other ſuch intricate and perplexing queſtions. The ſacred and venerable ſimplicity of the primitive times, which required no more than a true faith in the word of God, and a ſincere obedience to his holy laws, appeared little better than ruſticity and ignorance to the ſubtile doctors of this quibbling age. Yet ſo it happened, that many of the over-curious divines, who attempted to explain the nature and remove the difficulties of theſe intricate doctrines, ſucceeded very ill in this matter. Inſtead of leading men into the paths of humble faith and genuine piety, they bewildered them in the labyrinths of controverſy and contention, and rather darkened than illuſtrated the ſacred myſteries of religion by a thick cloud of unintelligible ſubtilties, ambiguous terms, and obſcure diſtinctions. Hence aroſe new matter of animoſity and diſpute, of bigotry and uncharitableneſs, which flowed like a torrent through ſucceeding ages, and which all human efforts ſeem unable to vanquiſh. In theſe diſputes, the heat of paſſion, and the exceſſive force of religious antipathy and contradiction, hurried frequently the contending parties into the moſt dangerous extremes.

uperſtition rows pace.

II. If, before this time, the luſtre of religion was clouded with ſuperſtition, and its divine precepts adulterated with a mixture of human inventions, this evil, inſtead of diminiſhing, increaſed daily. The happy ſouls of departed Chriſtians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by aſſiduous and fervent prayers; while none ſtood up to cenſure or oppoſe this preposterous worſhip. The queſtion, how the prayers of mortals aſcended to the celeſtial ſpirits (a queſtion which afterwards produced much wrangling and many idle fancies), did not as yet occaſion

occaſion any difficulty. For the Chriſtians of this century did not imagine that the ſouls of the ſaints were ſo entirely confined to the celeſtial manſions, as to be deprived of the privilege of viſiting mortals, and travelling, when they pleaſed, through various countries. They were further of opinion, that the places moſt frequented by departed ſpirits were thoſe where the bodies they had formerly animated were interred; and this opinion, which the Chriſtians borrowed from the Greeks and Romans, rendered the ſepulchres of the ſaints the general rendezvous of ſuppliant multitudes [*x*]. The images of thoſe, who, during their lives, had acquired the reputation of uncommon ſanctity, were now honoured with a particular worſhip in ſeveral places; and many imagined, that this worſhip drew down into the images the propitious preſence of the ſaints or celeſtial beings they repreſented; deluded, perhaps, into this idle fancy by the crafty fictions of the heathen prieſts, who had publiſhed the ſame thing concerning the ſtatues of JUPITER and MERCURY [*y*]. A ſingular and irreſiſtible efficacy was alſo attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the croſs, in defeating the attempts of Satan, removing all ſorts of calamities, and in healing not only the diſeaſes of the body, but alſo thoſe of the mind [*z*]. We ſhall not

[*x*] LACTANTIUS, *Divinar. Inſtitutionum*, lib. i. p. 164. HESIODUS, *Opp. et Dier.* ver. 122. Compare with theſe, SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Epiſt.* ii. p. 371. *Dial.* ii. cap. xiii. p 474. *Dial.* iii. p. 512. ÆNEAS GAZÆUS, *in Theophraſto*, p. 65. MACARIUS in JAC. TOLLII *Inſignibus Itineris Italici*, p. 197. and other writers of this age.

[*y*] CLEMENTINA, *Homil.* x. p. 697. tom. i. *PP. Apoſtolic.* ARNOBIUS, *adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 254. CASP. BARTHIUS, *ad Rutilium Numantian.* p. 250.

[*z*] PRUDENTIUS, *Hymn.* xi. *de Coronis*, p. 150, 151. SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Ep.* i. p. 364. ÆNEAS GAZÆUS, *in Theophraſto*, p. 173.

CENT. V. PART II.

enter here into a particular account of the public ſupplications, the holy pilgrimages, the ſuperſtitious ſervices paid to departed ſouls, the multiplication of temples, altars, penitential garments, and a multitude of other circumſtances, that ſhewed the decline of genuine piety, and the corrupt darkneſs that was eclipſing the luſtre of primitive Chriſtianity. As there were none in theſe times to hinder the Chriſtians from retaining the opinions of their Pagan anceſtors concerning departed ſouls, heroes, demons, temples, and ſuch like matters, and even transferring them into their religious ſervices; and as, inſtead of entirely aboliſhing the rites and inſtitutions of ancient times, theſe inſtitutions were ſtill obſerved with only ſome ſlight alterations; all this ſwelled of neceſſity the torrent of ſuperſtition, and deformed the beauty of the Chriſtian religion and worſhip with thoſe corrupt remains of paganiſm, which ſtill ſubſiſt in a certain church.

It will not be improper to obſerve here, that the famous Pagan doctrine, concerning the *purification of departed ſouls*, by means of a certain kind of *fire*, was more amply explained and confirmed now than it had formerly been [*a*]. Every body knows, that this doctrine proved an inexhauſtible ſource of riches to the clergy through the ſucceeding ages, and that it ſtill enriches the Romiſh church with its nutritious ſtreams.

terpreta-
ns of
ipture.

III. The interpretation of the Holy Scriptures employed fewer pens in this century than in the preceding age, in which the Chriſtian doctors were leſs involved in the labyrinths of controverſy. Yet, notwithſtanding the multiplication of reli-

[*a*] See, particularly concerning this matter, AUGUSTIN, his book *de* VIII *Quæſtionibus ad Dulcitium*, *N.* xiii. tom. vi. opp. p. 128. *De fide et operibus*, cap. xvi. p. 182. *De fide, ſpe, et charitate*, § 118. p. 222. *Enarratione Pſal.* xxxv. § 3, &c.

gious

gious diſputes, a conſiderable number of learned men undertook this uſeful and important taſk. We ſhall not mention thoſe who confined their illuſtrations to ſome one or a few books of the divine word, ſuch as VICTOR of *Antioch*, POLYCHRONIUS, PHILO CARPATHIUS, ISIDORE of *Cordona*, SALONIUS, and ANDREW of *Cæſarea*. We muſt not, however, paſs over in ſilence THEODORET and THEODORE, biſhops of *Cyrus* and *Mopſueſtia*, the two moſt famous expoſitors of this age, who illuſtrated a great part of the Holy Scriptures by their pious labours. They were truly eminent both in point of learning and genius; and, free and unprejudiced in their ſearch after truth, they followed the explications of ſcripture given by their predeceſſors, only as far as they found them agreeable to reaſon. The commentaries of THEODORET are yet extant, and in the hands of the learned [*b*]; thoſe of THEODORE are concealed in the eaſt among the Neſtorians, though on many accounts worthy to ſee the light [*c*]. CYRIL, of *Alexandria*, deſerves alſo a place among the commentators of this century; but a ſtill higher rank, among that uſeful and learned body, is due to ISIDORE of *Peluſium*,

[*b*] See SIMON, *Hiſtoire critique des principaux Commentateurs de N. Teſt.* ch. xxii. p. 314; as alſo his *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſiaſt. de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 180. ☞ THEODORET wrote Commentaries upon the five books of *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, *Samuel*, *Kings*, *Chronicles*, the *Pſalms*, the *Canticles*, *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Baruch*, *Lamentations*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, the XII *leſſer Prophets*, and *St. Paul's* XIV *Epiſtles*.

[*c*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatic.* tom. iii. § 2. p. 227. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſ. de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 108. 677. ☞ We are aſſured by FABRICIUS, upon the teſtimony of LAMBECIUS, that THEODORE's Commentary upon the XII *Prophets* is ſtill in being, in MS. in the emperor's library at *Vienna*. See FABR. *Bibl. Græc.* tom. ix. p. 162. See alſo, for an ample and learned account of the writings of this author, LARDNER's *Credibility*, &c. vol. ix. p. 389.

whoſe

whoſe epiſtles contain many obſervations, which caſt a conſiderable degree of light upon ſeveral parts of ſcripture [*d*].

Many chimerical and weak commentators.

IV. It is, however, to be lamented, that the greateſt part of the commentators, both Greek and Latin, following the idle fancies of ORIGEN, overlooked the true and natural ſenſe of the words, and hunted after ſubtile and hidden ſignifications, for *myſteries* (as the Latins then termed them) in the plaineſt precepts of the Holy Scriptures. Several of the Greeks, and particularly THEODORET, laboured, with ſucceſs and preciſion, in illuſtrating the books of the New Teſtament; and their ſucceſs here is to be principally attributed to their perfect knowledge of the Greek language, which they had learned from their infancy. But neither the Greeks nor Latins caſt much light upon the Old Teſtament, which was cruelly tortured by the allegorical pens of almoſt all who attempted to illuſtrate and explain it. For nothing is more common, than to ſee the interpreters of the fifth century ſtraining all the paſſages of that ſacred book either to typify CHRIST, and the bleſſings of his kingdom, or Anti-chriſt, and the wars and deſolations which he was to bring upon the earth, and that, without the leaſt ſpark of judgment, or the ſmalleſt air of probability.

Some of more wiſdom and judgment.

V. A few choſen ſpirits, ſuperior to the others in ſagacity and wiſdom, were bold enough to ſtand up againſt theſe critical deluſions, and to point out a ſafer and plainer way to divine truth. This we learn from the epiſtles of ISIDORE of *Peluſium*, who, though he was not himſelf entirely free from this allegorical contagion, yet cenſures

[*d*] See, for an account of theſe two authors, SIMON, *Hiſtoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Teſtament*, chap. xxi. p. 300.

judiciouſly,

judiciously, in many places, those that abandoned the historical sense of the Old Testament, and applied, universally, all its narrations and predictions to CHRIST alone. But none went greater lengths in censuring the fanciful followers of ORIGEN, than THEODORE of *Mopsuestia*, who not only wrote *a book concerning allegory and history against* ORIGEN [e], but also, in his *commentary on the prophets*, did not hesitate to apply the most of their predictions to various events in ancient history [f]. This manner of interpreting scripture was very ill received, and contributed, perhaps, more to raise the general cry against him, than all the erroneous doctrines with which he was charged [g]. The Nestorians followed the example of this remarkable and eminent man [h]; and still continue to consider him as a saint of the first order, and to preserve his writings with the utmost care, as precious monuments of his piety and learning.

VI. The doctrines of religion were, at this time, understood and represented in a manner that favoured little of their native purity and sim- Dialectic theology.

[e] FACUNDUS HERMIANENSIS, *De tribus Capitulis*, lib. iii. cap. vi. LIBERATUS *in Breviario*, cap. xxiv.

[f] *Acta Concilii Constantinopol.* II. *seu Oecumenici* V. tom. iii. *Conciliorum*, p. 58. edit. Harduini.

☞ [g] THEODORE, after his death, was considered as the parent of the Pelagian and Nestorian heresies; though, during his life, he was held in the highest esteem, and died in the communion of the church.

[h] This appears by the testimony of COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES, a writer of the sixth century, who was, undoubtedly, a Nestorian. For this author, in the fifth book of his *Christian Topography*, which MONTFAUCON published in his new collection of the Greek fathers, maintains, that of all the Psalms of DAVID, four only are applicable to CHRIST. And to confirm this his opinion, he affirms boldly, that the writers of the New Testament, when they apply to JESUS the prophecies of the Old, do this rather by a mere accommodation of the words, without any regard to their true and genuine sense,

CENT. V. PART II.

plicity. They were drawn out by laboured commentaries beyond the terms in which the divine wiſdom had thought fit to reveal them; and were examined with that minuteneſs and ſubtilty that were only proper to cover them with obſcurity. And, what was ſtill worſe, the theological notions that generally prevailed, were proved rather by the authorities and logical diſcuſſions of the ancient doctors, than by the unerring dictates of the divine word. It does not appear that in this century any attempted to form a complete ſyſtem of theology, unleſs we give that title to *ſix books of inſtruction*, which NICAEAS is ſaid to have compoſed for the uſe of the Neophytes [*i*]. But, as we have already obſerved, the principal branches of religion were laboriouſly explained in the various books that were written againſt the Neſtorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

The managers of the controverſy againſt the Jews, Pagans, and Sectaries.

VII. The number of thoſe, who diſputed in this century againſt paganiſm and infidelity, was very conſiderable, yet not greater than the exigency of the times and the frequent attacks made upon Chriſtianity rendered neceſſary. THEODORET, in his ingenious and learned treatiſe, *De curandis Græcorum affectionibus*, ORIENTIUS, in his *Commonitorium*, and EVAGRIUS, in his *Diſpute between* ZACHAEUS and APOLLONIUS, oppoſed, with fortitude and vigour, thoſe that worſhipped images, and offered their religious ſervices to the Pagan deities [*k*]. To theſe we may add, PHILIP SEDETES and PHILOSTORGIUS, of whom the latter attacked PORPHYRY, and the former JULIAN. BASILIUS of *Seleucia*; GREGENTIUS, in his *Controverſy with* HERBANUS; and EVAGRIUS, in his *Dialogue between* THEOPHILUS *and* JUDÆUS,

[*i*] GENNADIUS MASSILIENSIS, *De Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* cap. xxii. p. 28. edit. Fabric.

[*k*] See, for an account of ORIENTIUS and EVAGRIUS, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 121 and 252.

expoſed and refuted the errors and cavils of the Jews. VOCONIUS the African; SYAGRIUS, in his *Book concerning Faith*; GENNADIUS of *Marſeille*, who deſerves to be placed in the firſt rank; and THEODORET, in his *Treatiſe concerning the Fables of the Heretics*, oppoſed all the different ſects; not to mention thoſe who wrote only againſt the errors of one or other particular party.

VIII. Thoſe who diſputed againſt the Chriſtian ſects, obſerved a moſt abſurd and vicious method of controverſy. They proceeded rather according to the rules of the ancient ſophiſts, and, what is ſtill more ſurpriſing, according to the ſpirit of the *Roman law*, than by the examples and inſtructions of CHRIST and his apoſtles. In the Roman courts, matters of a difficult and doubtful nature were decided by the authority of certain aged lawyers, who were diſtinguiſhed by their abilities and experience. And when they happened to differ in opinion, the point was determined either by a plurality of voices, or by the ſentiments of the more learned and illuſtrious members of that venerable body [*l*]. This procedure of the Roman tribunals was, in this century, admitted as a ſtanding law, both in the deliberations and councils, and in the management of religious controverſy, to the great and unſpeakable detriment of truth. For by this, reaſon and even common ſenſe were, in ſome meaſure, excluded from every queſtion; and that was determined as *right* and *true*, which appeared ſuch to the greateſt number, or had been approved by doctors of the greateſt note in preceding times. The *acts* of the various *councils*, which are yet extant, manifeſtly ſhew that this was the caſe. And this circumſtance, combined with what we

The defects of theſe diſputants.

[*l*] See the *Codex Theodoſ.* lib. i. tit. iv. *De reſponſis prudentum*, p. 32. edit. Ritterian.

have

have already obſerved with reſpect to the diſputants of the age now under conſideration, make it eaſy for us to imagine the various defects that muſt have prevailed in the methods of defending truth, and oppoſing error.

Spurious writings.

IX. This abſurd imitation of the Roman law in the management of religious controverſy, this prepoſterous method of deciding truth by human authorities, were fruitful ſources of ſpurious and ſuppoſititious productions. For many audacious impoſtors were hence encouraged to publiſh their own writings under the names of ancient Chriſtian worthies, nay, under the ſacred names of, even, CHRIST himſelf and his holy apoſtles; that thus in the deliberations of councils, and in the courſe of controverſy, they might have authorities to oppoſe to authorities in defence of their reſpective opinions. The whole Chriſtian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with theſe infamous cheats, theſe ſpurious productions. This is ſaid to have engaged GELASIUS, the Roman pontif, to call together a council, compoſed of the biſhops of the Latin church; in which aſſembly, after a ſtrict examination of thoſe writings which appeared under great and venerable names, the famous decree paſſed, that deprived ſo many *apocryphal* books of their borrowed authority. That ſomething of this kind really happened, it would be, perhaps, an inſtance of temerity to deny: but many learned men aſſert, that the decree attributed to GELASIUS, labours under the ſame inconveniency with the books which it condemns, and was, by no means, the production of that pontif, but of ſome deceiver, who uſurped clandeſtinely his name and authority [*m*].

[*m*] PEARSONUS, *Vindiciar. Ignatianar.* part I. cap. iv. p. 189. CAVE, *Hiſt. Litter. Scriptor. Eccleſiaſ.* p. 260. URB. GODOFR. SIBERUS, *Præfat. ad Enchiridion Sexti*, p. 79.

X. LUCHERIUS,

Moral writers.

X. EUCHERIUS, SALVIAN, and NILUS, ſhine with a ſuperior luſtre among the moral writers of this century. The epiſtle of EUCHERIUS, *concerning the Contempt of the World, and the ſecular Philoſophy*, is an excellent performance both in point of matter and ſtyle. The works of MARK the hermit breathe a ſpirit of fervent piety, but are highly defective in many reſpects. The matter is ill choſen, and it is treated without order, perſpicuity, or force of reaſoning. FASTIDIUS compoſed ſeveral diſcourſes concerning moral duties, but they have not ſurvived the ruins of time. The works, that are yet extant, of DIADOCHUS, PROSPER, and SEVERIAN, are extremely pleaſing on account of the ſolidity and elegance which are to be found, for the moſt part, in their moral ſentences, though they afford but indifferent entertainment to ſuch as are deſirous of preciſion, method, and ſound argumentation. And indeed this want of method in the diſtribution and arrangement of their matter, and a conſtant neglect of tracing their ſubject to its firſt principles, are defects common to almoſt all the moral writers of this century.

XI. Had this, indeed, been their only defect, the candid and impartial would have ſupported it with patience, and attributed it charitably to the infelicity of the times. But many of the writers and teachers of this age did unſpeakable injury to the cauſe of true piety by their crude and enthuſiaſtic inventions. The Myſtics, who pretended to higher degrees of perfection than other Chriſtians, drew every where to their party, particularly in the eaſtern provinces, a vaſt number of the ignorant and inconſiderate multitude, by the ſtriking appearance of their auſtere and ſingular piety. It is impoſſible to deſcribe the rigour and ſeverity of the laws which theſe ſenſeleſs fanatics impoſed upon themſelves, in order, as they alleged,

leged, to appeaſe the deity, and to deliver the *celeſtial ſpirit* from the bondage of this *mortal body*. They not only lived among the wild beaſts, but alſo lived after the manner of theſe ſavage animals; they ran naked through the lonely deſerts with a furious aſpect, and with all the agitations of madneſs and frenzy; they prolonged the life of their emaciated bodies by the wretched nouriſhment of graſs and wild herbs, avoided the ſight and converſation of men, remained motionleſs in certain places for ſeveral years, expoſed to the rigour and inclemency of the ſeaſons, and towards the concluſion of their lives ſhut themſelves up in narrow and miſerable huts; and all this was conſidered as true piety, the only acceptable method of worſhipping the deity, and rendering him propitious [*n*]. The greateſt part of the Myſtics were led into the abſurdities of this extravagant diſcipline, not ſo much by the pretended force of reaſon and argument, as by a natural propenſity to ſolitude, a gloomy and melancholy caſt of mind, and an implicit and blind ſubmiſſion to the authority and examples of others. For the diſeaſes of the mind, as well as thoſe of the body, are generally contagious, and no peſtilence ſpreads its infection with a more dreadful rapidity than ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm. Several perſons have committed to writing the precepts of this ſevere diſcipline, and reduced its abſurdities into a ſort of ſyſtem, ſuch as JULIANUS POMERIUS among the Latins [*o*], and many, among the Syrians, whoſe names it is needleſs to mention.

The ſuperſtition of the Stilites.

XII. Of all the inſtances of ſuperſtitious frenzy that diſgraced this age, none was held in higher

[*n*] See the *Pratum Spirituale* of MOSCHUS; the *Lauſiac Hiſtory* of PALLADIUS; as alſo SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i.

[*o*] POMERIUS wrote a treatiſe, *De Vita Contemplativa*, in which the doctrines and precepts of the Myſtics were carefully collected.

veneration, or excited more the wonder of the multitude, than that of a certain order of men, who were called Stilites by the Greeks, and Sancti Columnares, or Pillar Saints, by the Latins. Theſe were perſons of a moſt ſingular and extravagant turn of mind, who ſtood motionleſs upon the tops of *pillars*, expreſsly raiſed for this exerciſe of their patience, and remained there for ſeveral years, amidſt the admiration and applauſe of the ſtupid populace. The inventor of this ſtrange and ridiculous diſcipline was SIMEON, a Syrian, who began his follies by changing the agreeable employment of a ſhepherd, for the ſenſeleſs auſterities of the monkiſh life. But his enthuſiaſm carried him ſtill greater lengths; for, in order to climb as near heaven as he could, he paſſed thirty-ſeven years of his wretched life upon five pillars of ſix, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-ſix, and forty cubits high, and thus acquired a moſt ſhining reputation, and attracted the veneration of all about him [*p*]. Many of the inhabitants of *Syria* and *Paleſtine*, ſeduced by a falſe ambition, and an utter ignorance of true religion, followed the example of this fanatic, though not with the ſame degree of auſterity [*q*]. And, what is almoſt incredible, this

[*p*] See the *Acta Sanctorum Menſis Januarii*, tom. i. p. 261—277. where the reader will find the account we have given of this whimſical diſcipline. THEODORET, indeed, had before given ſeveral hints of it, alleging, among other things, that SIMEON had gradually added to the height of his pillar, with a deſign to approach, by this means, nearer to heaven. See TILLEMONT, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. xv. p. 347. edit. Paris. See alſo the *Acts of* SIMEON *the Stylite*, in STEPH. EUODII ASSEMANNI *Actis Martyrum, Orient. et Occident.* vol. ii. p. 227. publiſhed at *Rome*, in folio, in the year 1748.

[*q*] The learned FREDERIC SPANHEIM, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (p. 1154.), ſpeaks of a ſecond SIMEON the Stylite (mentioned by EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt.* lib. vi. cap. xxiii.) who

this ſuperſtitious practice continued in vogue until the twelfth century, when however it was, at length, totally ſuppreſſed [r].

The Latins had too much wiſdom and prudence to imitate the Syrians and Orientals in this whimſical ſuperſtition. And when a certain fanatic or impoſtor, named WULFILAICUS, erected one of theſe pillars in the country of *Treves*, and propoſed living upon it after the manner of SIMEON; the neighbouring biſhops ordered it to be pulled down, and thus nipped this ſpecies of ſuperſtition in the bud [s].

Further defects of the public inſtructors, and practical writers.

XIII. The Myſtic rules of diſcipline and manners had a bad effect upon the moral writers, and thoſe who were ſet apart for the inſtruction of Chriſtians. Thus, in inſtructing the catechumens and others, they were more diligent and zealous in inculcating a regard for the external parts of religion, and an attachment to bodily exerciſe, than in forming the heart and the affections to inward piety and ſolid virtue. Nay, they went ſo far, as to preſcribe rules of ſanctity and virtue little different from the unnatural rigour and fanatical piety of the Myſtics. SALVIAN, and other celebrated writers, gave it as their opinion, that none were truly and perfectly holy, but thoſe who abandoned all riches and honours, abſtained from matrimony, baniſhed all joy and chearful-

lived in the ſixth century. This ſecond fanatic ſeems to have carried his auſterities ſtill further than the chief of the ſect; for he remained upon his pillar ſixty-eight years, and from thence, like the firſt SIMEON, he taught, or rather deluded, the gazing multitude, declaimed againſt hereſy, pretended to caſt out devils, to heal diſeaſes, and to foretel future events.

[r] See URB. GODOFR. SIBERI *Diſſ. de Sanctis Columnaribus.* CAROLI MAJELLI *Diſſ. de Stylitis*, publiſhed in ASSEMANNI *Acta Martyr. Orient. & Occident.* tom. ii. p. 246, where may be ſeen a copper-plate print of SIMEON's pillar.

[s] GREGOR. TURONENS. *Hiſtor. Francor.* lib. viii. cap. xv. p. 387.

neſs

neſs from their hearts, and macerated their bodies with various ſorts of torments and mortifications. And as all could not ſupport ſuch exceſſive degrees of ſeverity, thoſe madmen, or fanatics, whoſe robuſt conſtitutions and ſavage tempers were the beſt adapted to this kind of life, were diſtinguiſhed by the public applauſe, and ſaw their influence and authority increaſe daily. And thus ſaints ſtarted up like muſhrooms in almoſt every place.

The controverſy between Jerome and Vigilantius.

XIV. A ſmall number of eccleſiaſtics, animated by the laudable ſpirit of reformation, boldly attempted to pluck up the roots of this growing ſuperſtition, and to bring back the deluded multitude from this vain and chimerical diſcipline to the practice of ſolid and genuine piety. But the votaries of ſuperſtition, who were ſuperior in number, reputation, and authority, reduced them ſoon to ſilence, and rendered their noble and pious efforts utterly ineffectual [*t*]. We have an example of this in the caſe of VIGILANTIUS, a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, who was born in *Gaul*, and went from thence to *Spain*, where he performed the functions of a preſbyter. This eccleſiaſtic, on his return from a voyage he had made into *Paleſtine* and *Egypt*, began, about the beginning of this century, to propagate ſeveral doctrines, and to publiſh repeated exhortations quite oppoſite to the opinions and manners of the times. Among other things, he denied that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs were to be honoured with any ſort of homage or worſhip; and therefore cenſured the pilgrimages that were made to places that were reputed holy. He turned into deriſion the prodigies which were ſaid to be wrought in the temples conſecrated to martyrs, and condemned

[*t*] AUGUSTIN complains of this, in his famous epiſtle to JANUARIUS, No. 119.

the cuſtom of performing vigils in them. He aſſerted, and indeed with reaſon, that the cuſtom of burning tapers at the tombs of the martyrs in broad day, was imprudently borrowed from the ancient ſuperſtition of the Pagans. He maintained, moreover, that prayers addreſſed to departed ſaints were void of all efficacy; and treated with contempt faſting and mortifications, the celibacy of the clergy, and the various auſterities of the monaſtic life. And, finally, he affirmed, that the conduct of thoſe who, diſtributing their ſubſtance among the indigent, ſubmitted to the hardſhips of a voluntary poverty, or ſent a part of their treaſures to *Jeruſalem* for devout purpoſes, had nothing in it acceptable to the Deity.

There were among the Gallic and Spaniſh biſhops ſeveral that reliſhed the opinions of VIGILANTIUS. But JEROME, the great monk of the age, aſſailed this bold reformer of religion with ſuch bitterneſs and fury, that the honeſt preſbyter ſoon found that nothing but his ſilence could preſerve his life from the intemperate rage of bigotry and ſuperſtition. This project then of reforming the corruptions, which a fanatical and ſuperſtitious zeal had introduced into the church, was choked in its birth [*u*]. And the name of good VIGILANTIUS remains ſtill in the *liſt of heretics*, which is acknowledged as authentic by thoſe who, without any regard to their own judgment or the declarations of ſcripture, followed blindly the deciſions of antiquity.

Diſputes about Origeniſm.

XV. The controverſies, which had been raiſed in *Egypt*, concerning ORIGEN and his doctrine, towards the concluſion of the preceding century, were now renewed at *Conſtantinople*, and carried on without either decency or prudence. The Nitrian

[*u*] BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article VIGILANTIUS. BARBEYRAC, *De la Morale des Peres*, p. 252. GERHAR. Jo. VOSSIUS, *Theſibus Hiſtorico-Theologicis*, p. 170. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 57.

monks,

monks, baniſhed from *Egypt*, on account of their attachment to ORIGEN, took refuge at *Conſtantinople*, and were treated, by JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, the biſhop of that city, with clemency and benignity. This no ſooner came to the knowledge of THEOPHILUS, patriarch of *Alexandria*, than he formed a perfidious project againſt the eloquent prelate; and ſent the famous EPIPHANIUS, with ſeveral other biſhops, to *Conſtantinople*, to compaſs his fall, and deprive him of his epiſcopal dignity. No time could be more favourable for the execution of this project, than that in which it was formed; for CHRYSOSTOM, by his auſterity, and his vehement declamations againſt the vices of the people, and the corrupt manners of the ladies of the court, had incurred the diſpleaſure of many, and had alſo excited, in a more particular manner, the reſentment and indignation of the empreſs EUDOXIA, wife of ARCADIUS. This violent princeſs ſent for THEOPHILUS and the Egyptian biſhops, who, purſuant to her orders, repaired to *Conſtantinople*; and having called a council, inquired into the religious ſentiments of CHRYSOSTOM, and examined his morals, and the whole courſe of his conduct and converſation, with the utmoſt ſeverity. This council, which was held in the ſuburbs of *Chalcedon*, in the year 403, with THEOPHILUS at its head, declared CHRYSOSTOM unworthy of his high rank in the church, on account of the favourable manner in which he ſtood diſpoſed towards ORIGEN and his followers; and, in conſequence of this decree, condemned him to baniſhment. The people of *Conſtantinople*, who were tenderly attached to their pious and worthy biſhop, roſe in a tumultuous manner, and prevented the execution of this unrighteous ſentence [*w*]. When this tumult was entirely huſhed,

☞ [*w*] This is not quite exact. For it appears, by the accounts of the beſt Hiſtorians, that this ſentence was really

ed, the ſame unrelenting judges, in order to ſatisfy their vindictive rage and that of EUDOXIA, renewed their ſentence, the year following, under another pretext [x], and with more ſucceſs; for the pious CHRYSOSTOM, yielding to the redoubled efforts of his enemies, was baniſhed to *Cucuſus*, a city of *Cilicia*, where he died about three years after [y].

The exile of this illuſtrious man was followed by a terrible ſedition of the Johanniſts (ſo his votaries were called), which was calmed, though with much difficulty, by the edicts of ARCADIUS [z]. It is beyond all doubt, that the proceedings againſt CHRYSOSTOM were cruel and unjuſt; in this however he was to blame, that he aſſumed the authority and rank which had been granted, by the council of *Conſtantinople*, to the biſhops of that imperial city, and ſet himſelf up as a judge of the controverſy between THEOPHILUS and the Egyptian monks, which the Alexandrian prelate could not behold without the utmoſt impatience and reſentment. Theſe monks, when they loſt their protector, were reſtored to the favour of THEOPHILUS; but the faction of the Origeniſts conti-

executed, and that the emperor confirmed the decree of this firſt ſynod, by baniſhing CHRYSOSTOM into *Bithynia*; or, as others allege, by ordering him to retire to the country. A violent earthquake and a terrible ſhower of hail, which were looked upon by the multitude as judgments occaſioned by the unrighteous perſecution of their pious biſhop, alarmed the court, and engaged them to recal CHRYSOSTOM to his office.

☞[x] This new pretext was the indecent manner, in which CHRYSOSTOM is ſaid to have declaimed againſt EUDOXIA, on account of her having erected her ſtatue in ſilver near the church.

[y] See TILLEMONT and HERMANT, who have both written the life of CHRYSOSTOM; as alſo BAYLE's *Dictionary*, in Engliſh, at the article ACACIUS.

[z] See CYRILLI *vitæ Sabæ in* COTELERII *Monument. Eccleſ. Græc.* tom. ii. p. 274. Jos. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 31.

nued, notwithſtanding all this, to flouriſh in *Egypt*, *Syria*, and the adjacent countries, and held their chief reſidence at *Jeruſalem*. CENT. V. PART II.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies greatly multiplied.

I. TO enumerate the rites and inſtitutions that were added, in this century, to the Chriſtian worſhip, would require a volume of a conſiderable ſize. The *acts of councils*, and the records left us by the moſt celebrated ancient writers, are the ſources from whence the curious may draw a ſatisfactory and particular account of this matter; and to theſe we refer ſuch as are deſirous of ſomething more than a general view of the ſubject under conſideration. Several of theſe ancient writers, uncorrupted by the contagious examples of the times in which they lived, have ingenuouſly acknowledged that true piety and virtue were ſmothered, as it were, under that enormous burthen of ceremonies under which they lay groaning in this century. This evil was owing partly to the ignorance and diſhoneſty of the clergy; partly to the calamities of the times, which were extremely unfavourable to the purſuit of knowledge, and to the culture of the mind; and partly, indeed, to the natural depravity of imperfect mortals, who are much more diſpoſed to worſhip with the eye than with the heart, and are more ready to offer to the deity the laborious pomp of an outward ſervice, than the nobler, yet ſimple oblation of pious diſpoſitions and holy affections.

A general view of the new rites introduced at this time.

II. Divine worſhip was now daily riſing from one degree of pomp to another, and degenerating more

CENT. V. PART II.

more and more into a gaudy ſpectacle, only proper to attract the ſtupid admiration of a gazing populace. The ſacerdotal garments were embelliſhed with a variety of ornaments, with a view to excite in the minds of the multitude a greater veneration for the ſacred order. New acts of devotion were alſo celebrated. In *Gaul*, particularly, the ſolemn *prayers* and *ſupplications*, which uſually precede the anniverſary of CHRIST's aſcenſion, were now inſtituted for the firſt time [*a*]. In other places, perpetual acclamations of praiſe to God were performed both night and day by ſingers, who ſucceeded each other, ſo as that the ſervice ſuffered no interruption [*b*]; as if the Supreme Being took pleaſure in ſuch noiſy and turbulent ſhouting, or received any gratification from the blandiſhments of men. The riches and magnificence of the churches exceeded all bounds [*c*]. They were alſo adorned with coſtly images, among which, in conſequence of the Neſtorian controverſy, that of the Virgin MARY, holding the child JESUS in her arms, obtained the firſt and principal place. The altars, and the cheſts in which the relics were preſerved, were in moſt places made of ſolid ſilver. And from this we may eaſily imagine the ſplendor and expences that were laviſhed upon the other utenſils which were employed in the ſervice of the church.

The feaſts of charity.

III. On the other hand, the *agapæ*, or *feaſts of charity*, were now ſuppreſſed, on account of the abuſes to which they gave occaſion, amidſt the daily decline of that piety and virtue, which

[*a*] See SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, *Epiſt.* lib. v. *epiſt.* xvi, lib. vi. *epiſt.* i.; as alſo MARTENE, *Theſaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. v. p. 47.

[*b*] GERVAIS, *Hiſtoire de Suger*, tom. i. p. 23.

[*c*] See ZACHARIAS of *Mitylene*, *De opificio Mundi*, p. 165, 166.

rendered

rendered theſe meetings uſeful and edifying in the primitive ages.

A new method alſo of proceeding with *penitents* was introduced into the Latin church. For grievous offenders, who had formerly been obliged to confeſs their guilt in the face of the congregation, were now delivered from this mortifying penalty, and obtained, from LEO the GREAT, a permiſſion to *confeſs* their crimes *privately* to a prieſt appointed for that purpoſe. By this change of the ancient diſcipline, one of the greateſt reſtraints upon licentiouſneſs, and the only remaining barrier of chaſtity, was entirely removed, and the actions of Chriſtians were ſubject to no other ſcrutiny than that of the clergy; a change, which was frequently convenient for the ſinner, and alſo advantageous in many reſpects to the ſacred order.

Penitents.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diſſenſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

I. SEVERAL of thoſe ſects, which had divided the church in the preceding ages, renewed their efforts at this time, to propagate their reſpective opinions, and introduced new tumults and animoſities among the Chriſtians. We ſhall ſay nothing of the Novatians, Marchionites, and Manicheans, thoſe inauſpicious and fatal names that diſgrace the earlier annals of the church, though it is evident, that as yet their ſects ſubſiſted, and were even numerous in many places. We ſhall confine ourſelves to an account of the Donatiſts and Arians, who were the peſts of the preceding century.

Ancient hereſies revived.

The

The Donatiſts.

The Donatiſts had hitherto maintained themſelves with a ſucceſsful obſtinacy, and their affairs were in a good ſtate. But, about the beginning of this century, the face of things changed much to their diſadvantage, by the means of St. AUGUSTINE, biſhop of *Hippo*. The Catholic biſhops of *Africa*, animated by the exhortations and conducted by the counſels of this zealous prelate, exerted themſelves with the utmoſt vigour in the deſtruction of this ſeditious ſect, whom they juſtly looked upon, not only as troubleſome to the church by their obſtinacy, but alſo as a nuiſance to the ſtate by the brutal ſoldiery [*d*] which they employed in their cauſe. Accordingly deputies were ſent, in the year 404, from the council of *Carthage*, to the emperor HONORIUS, to requeſt, that the laws enacted againſt heretics, by the preceding emperors, might have force againſt the Donatiſts, who denied that they belonged to the heretical tribe; and alſo to deſire, that bounds might be ſet to the barbarous fury of the Circumcelliones. The firſt ſtep that the emperor took, in conſequence of this requeſt, was to impoſe a fine upon all the Donatiſts, who refuſed to return into the boſom of the church, and to ſend their biſhops and doctors into baniſhment. The year following, new laws, much ſeverer than the former, were enacted againſt this rebellious ſect, under the title of *Acts of uniformity*. And as the magiſtrates were remiſs in the execution of them, the council of *Carthage*, in the year 407, ſent a ſecond time deputies to the emperor, to deſire that certain perſons might be appointed to execute theſe *edicts* with vigour and impartiality; and their requeſt was granted.

II. The faction of the Donatiſts, though much broke by theſe repeated ſhocks, was yet far from being

[*d*] The *Circumcelliones* already mentioned.

being totally extinguiſhed. It recovered a part of its ſtrength in the year 408, after STILICHO had been put to death by the order of HONORIUS, and gained a ſtill further acceſſion of vigour the year following, in which the emperor publiſhed a law in favour of liberty of conſcience, and prohibited all compulſion in matters of religion. This law, however, was not of long duration. It was abrogated at the earneſt and repeated ſolicitations of the council, which was held at *Carthage* in the year 410; and MARCELLINUS the tribune was ſent by HONORIUS into *Africa*, with full power to bring to a concluſion this tedious and unhappy conteſt. MARCELLINUS therefore held at *Carthage*, in the year 411, a ſolemn *conference*, in which he examined the cauſe with much attention, heard the contending parties during the ſpace of three days, and, at length, pronounced ſentence in favour of the Catholics [*e*]. The Catholic biſhops, who were preſent at this conference, were 286 in number; and thoſe of the Donatiſts 279. The latter, upon their defeat, appealed to the emperor; but without effect. The glory of their defeat was due to AUGUSTIN, who bore the principal part in this controverſy, and

[*e*] See FRANC. BALDUIN, *Hiſt. Collationis Carthag.* in OPTAT. *Milev. Pinian.* p. 337. It is proper to obſerve, here, that this *meeting*, held by MARCELLINUS, is very improperly termed a *conference (collatio)*. For there was no diſpute carried on at this meeting between the Catholics and the Donatiſts; nor did any of the parties endeavour to gain or defeat the other by ſuperiority of argument. This conference then was properly a *judicial trial*, in which MARCELLINUS was, by the emperor, appointed judge, or arbiter, of this religious controverſy, and accordingly pronounced ſentence after a proper hearing of the cauſe. It appears therefore from this event, that the notion of a ſupreme ſpiritual judge of controverſy, and ruler of the church, appointed by CHRIST, had not as yet entered into any one's head; ſince we ſee the African biſhops themſelves appealing to the emperor in the preſent religious queſtion.

CENT. V. PART II.

who, indeed, by his writings, counſels, and admonitions, governed almoſt the whole *African* church, and alſo the principal and moſt illuſtrious heads of that extenſive province.

III. By this conference, the party of the Donatiſts was greatly weakened; nor could they ever get the better of this terrible ſhock, though the face of affairs changed afterwards in a manner that was proper to revive their hopes. The greateſt part of them, through the fear of puniſhment, ſubmitted to the emperor's decree, and returned into the boſom of the church; while the ſevereſt penalties were inflicted upon thoſe who remained obſtinate, and perſiſted in their rebellion. Fines, baniſhment, confiſcation of goods, were the ordinary puniſhments of the obſtinate Donatiſts; and even the pain of death was inflicted upon ſuch as ſurpaſſed the reſt in perverſeneſs, and were the ſeditious ringleaders of that ſtubborn faction. Some avoided theſe penalties by flight, others by concealing themſelves, and ſome were ſo deſperate as to ſeek deliverance by ſelf-murther, to which the Donatiſts had a ſhocking propenſity. In the mean time, the Circumcelliones uſed more violent methods of warding off the execution of the ſentence that was pronounced againſt their ſect; for they ran up and down through the province of *Africa* in the moſt outrageous manner, committing acts of cruelty every where, and defending themſelves by force of arms.

The Donatiſts, indeed, recovered afterwards their former liberty and tranquillity by the ſuccour and protection they received from the Vandals, who invaded *Africa*, with GENSERIC at their head, in the year 427, and took this province out of the hands of the Romans. The wound, however, that this ſect had received from the vigorous execution of the imperial laws, was ſo deep, that though they began to revive and multiply by

the

the aſſiſtance of the Vandals, yet they could never arrive at their former ſtrength and luſtre.

IV. The Arians, oppreſſed and perſecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among thoſe fierce and ſavage nations, who were gradually overturning the weſtern empire, and found among the Goths, Suevi, Heruli, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed reſidence and a peaceful retreat. And as their ſecurity animated their courage, they treated the Catholics with the ſame violence which the latter had employed againſt them and other heretics; and they perſecuted and vexed in various ways ſuch as profeſſed their adherence to the Nicene doctrines. The Vandals, who reigned in *Africa*, ſurpaſſed all the other ſavage nations in barbarity and injuſtice towards the Catholics. The kings of this fierce people, particularly GENSERIC and HUNERIC his ſon, pulled down the churches of thoſe Chriſtians who acknowledged the divinity of CHRIST, ſent their biſhops into exile, and maimed and tormented in various ways ſuch as were nobly firm and inflexible in the profeſſion of their faith [*f*]. They however declared, that, in uſing theſe ſevere and violent methods, they were authorized, by the example of the emperors, who had enacted laws of the ſame rigorous nature againſt the Donatiſts, the Arians, and other ſects who differed in opinion from the Chriſtians of *Conſtantinople* [*g*].

The ſtate of the Arians.

We muſt not here omit mentioning the ſtupendous miracle, which is ſaid to have been wrought during theſe perſecutions in *Africa*, and by which the Supreme Being is ſuppoſed to have declared his diſpleaſure againſt the Arians, and

[*f*] See VICTOR VITENS. lib. iii. *De perſequutione Vandalica*, which THEOD. RUINART publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1694, in 8vo. with his *Hiſtory* of the ſame perſecution.

[*g*] See the edict of HUNERIC, in the hiſtory of VICTOR, mentioned in the preceding note, lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 64.

his

his favour towards their adverſaries. This miracle conſiſted in enabling thoſe Catholics, whoſe tongues had been cut out by the Arian tyrant HUNERIC, to ſpeak diſtinctly, and to proclaim aloud the divine majeſty of the Saviour of the world. This remarkable fact can ſcarcely be denied, ſince it is ſupported by the teſtimony of the moſt credible and reſpectable witneſſes [*b*]; but

☞ [*b*] Theſe witneſſes, who had themſelves ocular demonſtration of the fact, were VICTOR of *Utica*, ÆNEAS of *Gaza* (who examined the mouths of the perſons in queſtion, and found that their tongues were entirely rooted out) PROCOPIUS, MARCELLINUS the count, and the emperor JUSTINIAN. Upon the authority of ſuch reſpectable teſtimonies, the learned ABBADIE formed a laboured and dexterous defence of the miraculous nature of this extraordinary fact, in his work, intitled, *La Triomphe de la Providence*, &c. vol. iii. page 255, &c. where all the fire of his zeal, and all the ſubtilty of his logic, ſeem to have been exhauſted. Dr. BERRIMAN, in his *Hiſtorical Account of the Trinitarian Controverſy*; as alſo in his ſermons preached at lady MOYER's lectures, in the year 1725; and Dr. CHAPMAN, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, have maintained the ſame hypotheſis. To the former, an anſwer was publiſhed by an anonymous writer, under the following title, *An Enquiry into the Miracle ſaid to have been wrought in the fifth Century, upon ſome orthodox Chriſtians, in favour of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, &c. *in a Letter to a Friend*. We may venture to ſay, that this anſwer is utterly unſatisfactory. The author of it, after having laboured to invalidate the teſtimony alleged in favour of the fact, ſeems himſelf ſcarcely convinced by his own arguments; for he acknowledges at laſt the poſſibility of the event, but perſiſts in denying the miracle, and ſuppoſes, that the cruel operation was ſo imperfectly performed upon theſe confeſſors, as to leave in ſome of them ſuch a ſhare of that organ, as was ſufficient for the uſe of ſpeech. Dr. MIDDLETON (to whom ſome have attributed the forementioned *Anſwer*) maintains the ſame hypotheſis, in his *Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers*, &c. ſuppoſing, that the tongues of the perſons in queſtion were not entirely rooted out, which he corroborates by the following conſideration, that two of the ſufferers are ſaid to have utterly loſt the faculty of ſpeaking. For though this be aſcribed to a peculiar judgment of God puniſhing the immoralities, of which they were afterwards guilty, yet this appears to the doctor, *to be a forced and improbable ſolution of the matter*, who imagines he ſolves it better by ſuppoſing, *that they*

but whether it is to be attributed to a ſuper- CENT. V.
natural and miraculous power, is a matter not PART II.
ſo

they had not been deprived of their intire tongues. He goes yet further, and produces two caſes from the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences at *Paris*, which prove in his opinion, "That this pretended miracle owed its whole credit "to our ignorance of the powers of nature." The firſt is, that of *a girl born without a tongue, who yet talked as eaſily and diſtinctly, as if ſhe had enjoyed the full benefit of that organ*; and the ſecond, that of *a boy, who, at the age of eight or nine years, loſt his tongue by a gangrene or ulcer, and yet retained the faculty of ſpeaking.* See MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry*, &c. p. 183, 184.

This reaſoning of the ſceptical doctor of divinity appeared ſuperficial and unſatisfactory to the judicious Mr. DODWELL, who (ſaying nothing about the caſe of the two Trinitarians who remained dumb, after their tongues were cut out, and whoſe dumbneſs is but indifferently accounted for by their immorality, ſince *gifts* have been often poſſeſſed without *graces*) confines himſelf to the conſideration of the two parallel facts drawn from the *Academical Memoirs* already mentioned. To ſhew that theſe facts prove little or nothing againſt the miracle in queſtion, he juſtly obſerves, that though, in one or two particular caſes, a mouth may be ſo ſingularly formed as to utter articulate ſounds, without the uſual inſtrument of ſpeech (ſome excreſcence probably ſupplying the defect), yet it cannot be any thing leſs than miraculous, that this ſhould happen to a conſiderable number of perſons, whoſe tongues were cut out to prevent their preaching a diſcountenanced doctrine. To deny the miracle in queſtion, we muſt maintain, that it is as eaſy to ſpeak without a tongue, as with it. See Mr. DODWELL's *Free Anſwer to Dr.* MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry*, &c. p. 96, 97, &c.

Mr. TOLL, who defended MIDDLETON's hypotheſis, has propoſed an objection *a priori*, as it may be juſtly called, againſt the truth of this miracle. He obſerves, that the occaſion on which it was wrought was not of ſufficient *conſequence* or *neceſſity* to require a divine interpoſition; for it was not wrought to convert infidels to Chriſtianity, but to bring over the followers of ARIUS to the Athanaſian faith; it was wrought, in a word, for the explication of a doctrine, which both ſides allowed to be founded in the New Teſtament. Now, as the Holy Scriptures are a revelation of the will of God, "it ſeems (ſays Mr. TOLL) to caſt a reflexion on his wiſdom, "as if he did things by halves, to ſuppoſe it neceſſary for "him to work miracles, in order to aſcertain the ſenſe of "thoſe ſcriptures. This (continues he) would be multiply-

"ing

CENT. V. PART II.

ſo eaſily decided, and which admits of much diſpute [*i*].

"ing miracles to an infinite degree;—beſides, it would de-
"ſtroy the univerſal truth of that propoſition from which we
"cannot depart, namely, *That the ſcriptures are ſufficiently*
"*plain in all things neceſſary to ſalvation.*" See Mr. TOLL's *Defence of Dr.* MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry, againſt Mr.* DODWELL's *Free Anſwer*, p. 81, 82. To this ſpecious objection Mr. DODWELL replies, that on the doctrine in diſpute between the Arians and the Orthodox depend the true notion, as well as the importance and reality of our ſalvation; that the doctrines, duties, and motives of Chriſtianity are *exalted* or *debaſed*, as we embrace the one or the other of thoſe ſyſtems; that on the *divinity* of CHRIST, the *meritorioufneſs* of the propitiation offered by him muſt entirely reſt; and that, therefore, no occaſion of greater conſequence can be aſſigned on which a miracle might be expected. He adds, that the diſputes which men have raiſed about certain doctrines, are no proof that theſe doctrines are not plainly revealed in ſcripture, ſeeing this would prove that no truth is there ſufficiently revealed, becauſe, at one time or other, they have been all diſputed; and he obſerves judiciouſly, that the expediency of interpoſing by miracles, is what we always are not competent judges of, ſince God only knows the times, ſeaſons, and occaſions, in which it is proper to alter the uſual courſe of nature, in order to maintain the truth, to ſupport the oppreſſed, and to carry on the great purpoſes of his goſpel kingdom. It is enough, that the preſent interpoſition be not *incredible*, to remove Mr. TOLL's objection, without conſidering its particular uſe, and the unexceptionable manner in which it is atteſted. See Mr. DODWELL's *Full and final Reply to Mr.* TOLL's *Defence*, &c. p. 270, 271.

We muſt obſerve here that this latter objection and anſwer are merely hypothetical, *i. e.* they draw their force only from the different opinions, which the ingenious Mr. TOLL and his learned antagoniſt entertain concerning the importance of the doctrine, in favour of which this pretended miracle is ſaid to have been wrought. The grand queſtion, whoſe deciſion alone can finiſh this controverſy, is, whether the tongues of theſe African confeſſors were entirely rooted out, or no? The caſe of the two who *remained dumb* furniſhes a ſhrewd preſumption, that the cruel operation was not equally performed upon all. The immorality of theſe two, and the judgment of God, ſuſpending with reſpect to them the influence of the miracle, do not ſolve this difficulty entirely, ſince (as we obſerved above) many have been poſſeſſed of *ſupernatural gifts* without *graces*; and CHRIST tells us, that many have *caſt out devils in his name*, whom at the laſt day he will not acknowledge as his faithful ſervants.

* V. A new

The riſe of Neſtorianiſm.

V. A new ſect, which was the ſource of moſt fatal and deplorable diviſions in the Chriſtian church, was formed by NESTORIUS, a Syrian biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, a diſciple of the celebrated THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, and a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, which were, however, accompanied with much levity and with intolerable arrogance. Before we enter into a particular account of the doctrine of this ſectary, it is proper to obſerve, that though, by the decrees of former councils, it had been clearly and peremptorily determined that CHRIST was, at the ſame time, true God and true man; yet no council had hitherto decreed any thing concerning the *manner* and *effect* of this union of the two natures in the divine Saviour; nor was this matter, as yet, become a ſubject either of inquiry or diſpute among Chriſtians. The conſequence of this was, that the Chriſtian doctors expreſſed themſelves differently concerning this myſtery. Some uſed ſuch forms of expreſſion as ſeemed to widen the difference between the ſon of God and the ſon of man, and thus to divide the nature of CHRIST into two diſtinct perſons. Others, on the contrary, ſeemed to confound too much the ſon of God with the ſon of man; and to ſuppoſe the nature of CHRIST *compoſed* of his divinity and humanity blended together into one.

The hereſy of APOLLINARIS had given occaſion to theſe different ways of ſpeaking. For he maintained that the man CHRIST was not endowed with a human ſoul, but with the divine nature, which was ſubſtituted in its place, and performed its functions; and this doctrine manifeſtly ſuppoſed a *confuſion* of the two natures in the MESSIAH. The Syrian doctors therefore, that they

[i] See RUINARTI *Hiſtor. Perſequut. Vandal.* part II. cap. vii. p. 482. See *Bibliotheque Britannique*, tom. iii. part II. p. 339. tom. v. part I. p. 171.

CENT. V. PART II.

might avoid the errors of APOLLINARIS, and exclude his followers from the communion of the church, were careful in eſtabliſhing an accurate diſtinction between the divine and the human nature in the ſon of God; and for this purpoſe they uſed ſuch forms of expreſſion as ſeemed to favour the notion of CHRIST's being compoſed of two *diſtinct perſons*. The manner of ſpeaking, adopted by the Alexandrians and Egyptians, had a different tendency, and ſeemed to countenance the doctrine of APOLLINARIS, and by a *confuſion* of the *two natures* to blend them into *one*. NESTORIUS, who was a Syrian, and had adopted the ſentiments of the doctors of his nation, was a violent enemy to all the ſects; but to none ſo much as to the Apollinarian faction, after whoſe ruin he breathed with an ardent and inextinguiſhable zeal. He therefore diſcourſed concerning the two natures in CHRIST after the Syrian manner, and commanded his diſciples to diſtinguiſh carefully between the *actions* and *perceptions* [*k*] of the ſon of God, and thoſe of the ſon of man [*l*].

The occaſion of the Neſtorian controverſy.

VI. The occaſion of this diſagreeable controverſy was furniſhed by the Preſbyter ANASTASIUS, a friend of NESTORIUS. This preſbyter, in a public diſcourſe delivered A. D. 428, declaimed

☞ [*k*] The original word *perpeſſio*, which ſignifies properly *ſuffering*, or *paſſion*, we have here tranſlated, by the general term, *perception*, becauſe *ſuffering*, or *paſſion*, cannot be, in any ſenſe, attributed to the *divine nature*.

[*l*] The Jeſuit DOUCIN publiſhed at *Paris*, A. D. 1716, *A hiſtory of Neſtorianiſm*: but it is ſuch a hiſtory as might be expected from a writer, who was obliged, by his profeſſion, to place the arrogant CYRIL among the ſaints, and NESTORIUS among the heretics. The ancient writers, on both ſides of this controverſy, are mentioned by Jo. FRANC. BUDDÆUS, in his *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1084. The accounts given of this diſpute by the Oriental writers, are collected by EUSEB. RENAUDOT. in his *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 108. and by Jos. SIM. ASSEMANNUS, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part II. p. 67.

warmly

warmly againſt the title of Θεοτόκος, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently attributed to the Virgin MARY in the controverſy againſt the Arians, than it had formerly been, and was a favourite term with the followers of APOLLINARIS. He, at the ſame time, gave it as his opinion, that the Holy Virgin was rather to be called Χριστοτόκος, i. e. *mother of Chriſt*, ſince the deity can neither be born nor die, and of conſequence the ſon of man alone could derive his birth from an earthly parent. NESTORIUS applauded theſe ſentiments, and explained and defended them in ſeveral diſcourſes[*m*]. But both he and his friend ANASTASIUS were keenly oppoſed by certain monks at *Conſtantinople*, who maintained that the ſon of MARY was *God incarnate*, and excited the zeal and fury of the populace to maintain this doctrine againſt NESTORIUS. Notwithſtanding all this, the diſcourſes of the latter were extremely well received in many places, and had the majority on their ſide. The Egyptian monks had no ſooner peruſed them, than they were perſuaded, by the weight of the arguments they contained, to embrace the opinions of NESTORIUS, and accordingly ceaſed to call the Bleſſed Virgin the *mother of God*.

Neſtorius and Cyril reciprocally anathematized by each other.

VII. The Prelate, who ruled the ſee of *Alexandria* at this time, was CYRIL, a man of a haughty, turbulent, and imperious temper, and painfully jealous of the riſing power and authority of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. As ſoon as this controverſy came to his knowledge, he cenſured the Egyptian monks and NESTORIUS; and, finding the latter little diſpoſed to ſubmit to his cenſure, he proceeded to violent meaſures, took counſel with CELESTINE, biſhop of *Rome*, whom

[*m*] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 2109. See alſo Jos. SIM. ASSEMANNUS, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part II. p. 199.

CENT. V. PART II.

he had engaged on his ſide, aſſembled a council at *Alexandria*, A. D. 430, and hurled no leſs than twelve anathemas at the head of NESTORIUS. The thunderſtruck prelate did not ſink under this violent ſhock; but, ſeeing himſelf unjuſtly accuſed of derogating from the majeſty of CHRIST, he retorted the ſame accuſation upon his adverſary, charged him with the Apollinarian hereſy, with confounding the two natures in CHRIST, and loaded CYRIL with as many anathemas as he had received from him. This unhappy conteſt between two biſhops of the firſt order proceeded rather from corrupt motives of jealouſy and ambition, than from a ſincere and diſintereſted zeal for the truth, and was the ſource of evils and calamities without number.

The Council of *Epheſus.*

VIII. When the ſpirits were ſo exaſperated on both ſides, by reciprocal excommunications and polemic writings, that there was no proſpect of an amicable iſſue to this unintelligible controverſy, THEODOSIUS the younger called a council at *Epheſus*, A. D. 431, which was the *third general council* in the annals of the church. In this council CYRIL preſided, though he was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of NESTORIUS; and he propoſed examining and determining the matter in debate before JOHN of *Antioch* and the other eaſtern biſhops arrived. NESTORIUS objected againſt this proceeding, as irregular and unjuſt; but, his remonſtrances being without effect, he refuſed to comply with the ſummons which called him to appear before the council. CYRIL, on the other hand, puſhing on matters with a lawleſs violence, NESTORIUS was judged without being heard; and, during the abſence of a great number of thoſe biſhops who belonged to the council, he was compared with the traitor JUDAS, charged with blaſphemy againſt the divine majeſty, deprived of his epiſcopal dignity,

and

and ſent into exile, where he finiſhed his days [*n*]. The tranſactions of this council will appear to the candid and equitable reader in the moſt unfavourable light, as full of low artifice, contrary to all the rules of juſtice, and even deſtitute of the leaſt air of common decency. The doctrine, however, that was eſtabliſhed in it concerning CHRIST, was that which has been always acknowledged and adopted by the majority of Chriſtians, *viz.* "That CHRIST was *one divine* "*perſon*, in whom *two natures* were moſt cloſely "and intimately united, but without being "mixed or confounded together."

IX. NESTORIUS, among other accuſations of leſs moment, was charged with dividing the nature of CHRIST into *two diſtinct perſons*, and with having maintained, that the *divine nature* was ſuperadded to the *human nature* of JESUS, after it was formed, and was no more than an auxiliary ſupport to the *man* CHRIST, through the whole of his life. NESTORIUS denied this charge even to the laſt, and ſolemnly profeſſed his entire diſapprobation of this doctrine [*o*]. Nor indeed

The judgment which the impartial will form concerning this controverſy.

was

[*n*] Thoſe that deſire a more ample account of this council, may conſult the *Variorum Patrum Epiſtolæ ad Concilium Epheſinum pertinentes*, publiſhed at *Louvain* in the year 1682, from ſome Vatican and other manuſcripts, by CHRISTIAN LUPUS. NESTORIUS, in conſequence of the ſentence pronounced againſt him in this council, was firſt baniſhed to *Petra* in *Arabia*, and afterwards to *Oaſis*, a ſolitary place in the deſerts of *Egypt*, where he died in the year 435. The accounts given of his tragical death by EVAGRIUS, in his *Eccl. Hiſt.* lib. i. cap. vii. and by THEODORUS the reader, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. ii. p. 565, are entirely fabulous. ☞ Dr. MOSHEIM's account of the time of NESTORIUS's death is perhaps unexact; for it appears, that NESTORIUS was at *Oaſis*, when SOCRATES wrote, that is, A.D. 439. See *Socrat.* lib. vii. cap. xxxiv.

[*o*] See GARNIER's edition of the works of MARIUS MERCATOR, tom. ii. p. 286. See alſo the fragments of thoſe letters which NESTORIUS wrote ſome time before his death, which

CENT. V. PART II.

was this opinion ever propoſed by him in any of his writings, but was only charged upon him by his iniquitous adverſaries, as a conſequence drawn from ſome incautious and ambiguous terms he uſed, and particularly from his refuſing to call the virgin MARY, the *mother of God* [*p*]. Hence many, nay, the greateſt part of writers both ancient and modern, after a thorough examination of this matter, have poſitively concluded that the opinions of NESTORIUS, and of the council which condemned them, were the ſame in effect; that their difference was in words only, and that the whole blame of this unhappy controverſy was to be charged upon the turbulent ſpirit of CYRIL, and his averſion to NESTORIUS [*q*].

This judgment may be juſt upon the whole; but it is however true, that NESTORIUS committed two faults in the courſe of this controverſy. The firſt was his giving offence to many Chriſtians by

which are to be found in Jos. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 40, 41.

☞ [*p*] It is remarkable, that CYRIL would not hear the explanations which NESTORIUS offered to give of his doctrine. Nay, the latter offered to grant the title of *Mother of God* to the Virgin MARY, provided that nothing elſe was thereby meant, but that *the man born of her was united to the divinity*. See *Socrat.* lib. vii. cap. xxxiv.

[*q*] LUTHER was the firſt of the modern writers who thought thus. And he inveighed againſt CYRIL, with the greateſt bitterneſs, in his book *De conciliis*, tom. viii. opp. Altenb. p. 265, 266, 273. See alſo BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the articles NESTORIUS and RODON. CHRIST. AUGUST. SALIG, *De Eutychianiſmo ante Eutychen*, p. 200. OTTO FRID. SCHUTZIUS, *De vita Chytræi*, lib. ii. cap. xxix. p. 190, 191. Jo. VOIGT. *Biblioth. Hiſtoriæ Hæreſiologicæ*, tom. i. part III. p. 457. PAUL. ERNEST. JABLONSKY, *Exerc. de Neſtorianiſmo*, publiſhed at *Berlin*, A. D. 1720. *Theſaur. Epiſtolic. Crozianus*, tom. i. p. 184. tom. iii. p. 175. *La Vie de la Croze, par* JORDAN, p. 231, and many others. As to the faults that have been laid to the charge of NESTORIUS, they are collected by ASSEMAN, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part II. p. 210.

abrogating

abrogating a trite and innocent term [r]; and the ſecond, his preſumptuouſly attempting to explain, by uncouth compariſons and improper expreſſions, a myſtery which infinitely ſurpaſſes the extent of our imperfect reaſon. If to theſe defects we add the deſpotic ſpirit and the exceſſive warmth of this perſecuted prelate, it will be difficult to decide who is moſt to be blamed, as the principal fomenter of this violent conteſt, CYRIL or NESTORIUS [s].

The progreſs of Neſtorianiſm after the council of *Epheſus*.

X. The council of *Epheſus*, inſtead of healing theſe diviſions, did but inflame them more and more, and almoſt deſtroyed all hope of reſtoring concord and tranquillity in the church. JOHN of *Antioch* and the other eaſtern biſhops, for whoſe arrival CYRIL had refuſed to wait, met at *Epheſus*, and pronounced againſt him and MEMNON, the biſhop of that city, who was his creature, as ſevere a ſentence as they had thundered againſt NESTORIUS. Hence aroſe a new and obſtinate diſſenſion between CYRIL and the Orientals, with JOHN the biſhop of *Antioch* at their head. This flame was indeed ſomewhat abated, A. D. 433, after CYRIL had received the *articles of faith* drawn up by JOHN, and abandoned certain phraſes and

☞ [r] The title of *Mother of God*, applied to the Virgin MARY, is not perhaps ſo *innocent* as Dr. MOSHEIM takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can preſent no idea at all, and to the ignorant and unwary it may preſent the moſt abſurd and monſtrous notions. The invention and uſe of ſuch myſterious terms, as have no place in ſcripture, are undoubtedly pernicious to true religion.

☞ [s] There is no difficulty at all in deciding this queſtion. NESTORIUS, though poſſeſſed of an arrogant and perſecuting ſpirit in general, yet does not ſeem to deſerve, in this particular caſe, the reproaches that are due to CYRIL. ANASTASIUS, and not NESTORIUS, was the firſt who kindled the flame; and NESTORIUS was the ſuffering and perſecuted party from the beginning of the controverſy to his death. His offers of accommodation were refuſed; his explanations were not read; his ſubmiſſion was rejected, and he was condemned unheard.

CENT. V. PART II.

expreſſions, of which the litigious might make a pernicious uſe. But the commotions, which aroſe from this fatal controverſy, were more durable in the eaſt [*t*]. Nothing could oppoſe the progreſs of Neſtorianiſm in thoſe parts. The diſcipline and friends of the perſecuted prelate carried his doctrine through all the Oriental provinces, and erected every where congregations which profeſſed an invincible oppoſition to the decrees of the council of *Epheſus*. The Perſians, among others, oppoſed CYRIL in the moſt vigorous manner, maintained that NESTORIUS had been unjuſtly condemned at *Epheſus*, and charged CYRIL with removing that diſtinction which ſubſiſts between the *two natures* in CHRIST. But nothing tended ſo much to propagate with rapidity the doctrine of NESTORIUS, as its being received in the famous ſchool which had for a long time flouriſhed at *Edeſſa*. For the doctors of this renowned academy not only inſtructed the youth in the Neſtorian tenets, but tranſlated from the Greek into the Syriac language the books of NESTORIUS, of his maſter THEODORUS of *Mopſueſtia*, and the writings alſo of DIODORUS of *Tarſus*, and ſpread them abroad throughout *Aſſyria* and *Perſia* [*u*].

Barſumas, a zealous promoter of Neſtorianiſm.

XI. Of all the promoters of the NESTORIAN cauſe, there was none to whom it has ſuch weighty obligations as to the famous BARSUMAS, who was ejected out of his place, in the ſchool of *Edeſſa*, and created biſhop of *Niſibis*, A. D. 435. This zealous prelate laboured with incredible aſſiduity,

[*t*] See CHRIST. AUG. SALIG, *De Eutychianiſmo ante Eutychen*, p. 243.

[*u*] See JOS. SIMON. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 351., tom. iii. part II. p. 69. This learned author may be advantageouſly uſed to correct what EUSEBIUS RENAUD. has ſaid (in the ſecond tome of his *Liturgiæ Orientales*, p. 99.) concerning the firſt riſe of the Neſtorian doctrine in the eaſtern provinces. See alſo the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of* THEODORUS *the reader*, book ii. p. 558.

and

and dexterity, from the year 440 to 485, to procure, for the Neſtorians, a ſolid and permanent ſettlement in *Perſia*; and he was vigorouſly ſeconded in this undertaking by MAANES biſhop of *Ardaſcira*. So remarkable was the ſucceſs which crowned the labours of BARSUMAS, that his fame extended throughout the eaſt; and the Neſtorians, which ſtill remain in *Chaldæa*, *Perſia*, *Aſſyria*, and the adjacent countries, conſider him alone, and not without reaſon, as their parent and founder. This indefatigable eccleſiaſtic not only perſuaded PHEROZES, the *Perſian* monarch, to expel out of his dominions ſuch Chriſtians as had adopted the opinions of the Greeks, and to admit the Neſtorians in their place, but he even engaged him to put the latter in poſſeſſion of the principal ſeat of eccleſiaſtical authority in *Perſia*, the ſee of *Seleucia*, which the Patriarch or Catholic of the Neſtorians has always filled even down to our time [*w*]. The zeal and activity of BARSUMAS did not end here: he erected a famous ſchool at *Niſibis*, from whence iſſued thoſe Neſtorian doctors, who, in this and the following century, ſpread abroad their tenets through *Egypt*, *Syria*, *Arabia*, *India*, *Tartary*, and *China* [*x*].

XII. The Neſtorians, before their affairs were thus happily ſettled, had been divided among themſelves with reſpect to the method of explain-

The diviſions of the Neſtorians ceaſe.

☞ [*w*] The biſhop of *Seleucia* was, by the twenty-third canon of the council of *Nice*, honoured with peculiar marks of diſtinction, and among others with the title of Catholic. He was inveſted with the power of ordaining archbiſhops (a privilege which belonged to the patriarchs alone), exalted above all the Grecian biſhops, honoured as a patriarch, and in the œcumenical councils was the fifth in rank after the biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. See *Acta Concilii Nicæni Arab.* ALPHONS. PISAN. lib. iii. can. xxiii. xxxiv.

[*x*] See, for an ample account of this matter, Jos. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. part II. p. 77.

ing

CENT. V. PART II.

ing their doctrine. Some maintained, that the *manner* in which the two natures were united in CHRIST, was abſolutely unknown: others, that the union of the divine nature with the man JESUS was only an union of *will*, *operation*, and *dignity* [y]. This diſſenſion, however, entirely ceaſed when the Neſtorians were gathered together into one religious community, and lived in tranquillity under their own eccleſiaſtical government and laws. Their doctrine, as it was then determined in ſeveral councils aſſembled at *Seleucia*, amounts to what follows: "That in the Saviour of the "world there were *two perſons*, or ὑποστάσεις; of "which the one was *divine*, even the eternal "WORD; and the other, which was *human*, was "the man JESUS; that theſe two perſons had "only one *aſpect* [z]; that the union between "the ſon of God and the ſon of man was formed "in the moment of the Virgin's conception, and "was never to be diſſolved; that it was not, "however, an union of nature or of perſon, "but only of will and affection; that CHRIST "was, therefore, to be carefully diſtinguiſhed "from GOD, who dwelt in him as in his temple; "and that MARY was to be called the *mother of* "CHRIST, and not the *mother of* GOD."

The abettors of this doctrine hold NESTORIUS in the higheſt veneration, as a man of ſingular and eminent ſanctity, and worthy to be had in perpetual remembrance: but they maintain, at the ſame time, that the doctrine he taught was much

[y] LEONTIUS BYZANT. *adverſus Neſtorian. et Eutychian.* p. 537. tom. i. *Lection. Antiquar.* HENR. CANISII. JAC. BASNAG. *Prolegomen. ad Caniſium*, tom. i. cap. ii. p. 19.

☞ [z] This is the only way I know of tranſlating the word *karſopa*, which was the term uſed by NESTORIUS, and which the Greeks render by the term πρόσωπον. The word *perſon* would have done better in this unintelligible phraſe, had it not been uſed immediately before in a different ſenſe from that which NESTORIUS would convey by the obſcure term *aſpect*.

older

older than himſelf, and had been handed down from the earlieſt times of the Chriſtian church; and for this reaſon they abſolutely refuſed the title of Neſtorians. And, indeed, if we examine the matter attentively, we ſhall find that BARSUMAS and his followers, inſtead of teaching their diſciples preciſely the doctrine of NESTORIUS, rather poliſhed and improved his uncouth ſyſtem to their own taſte, and added to it ſeveral tenets of which the good man never dreamt.

XIII. A violent averſion to the Neſtorian errors led many into the oppoſite extreme. This was the caſe with the famous EUTYCHES, abbot of a certain convent of monks at *Conſtantinople*, and founder of a ſect, which was in direct oppoſition to that of NESTORIUS, yet equally prejudicial to the intereſts of the Chriſtian church, by the peſtilential diſcords and animoſities it produced. The opinions of this new faction ſhot like lightning through the eaſt: and it acquired ſuch ſtrength in its progreſs, as to create much uneaſineſs both to the Greeks and Neſtorians, whoſe moſt vigorous efforts were not ſufficient to prevent its riſing to a high degree of credit and ſplendor. EUTYCHES began theſe troubles A. D. 448, when he was far advanced in years; and to exert his utmoſt force and vehemence in oppoſing the progreſs of the Neſtorian doctrine, he expreſſed his ſentiments concerning the perſon of CHRIST, in the very terms which the Egyptians made uſe of for that purpoſe, and taught, that *in* CHRIST *there was but one nature*, viz. *that of the incarnate word* [*a*]. Hence he was thought to deny

The Eutychian ſect.

[*a*] That CYRIL expreſſed himſelf in this manner, and appealed, for his juſtification in ſo doing, to the authority of ATHANASIUS, is evident beyond all poſſibility of contradiction. But it is uncertain whether or no this manner of expreſſion was adopted by ATHANASIUS, ſince many are of opinion,

CENT. V. PART II.

deny the existence of the human nature in CHRIST, and was accused of this, by EUSEBIUS of *Dorylæum*, in the council that was assembled by FLAVIANUS at *Constantinople*, probably this same year. By a decree of this council, he was ordered to renounce the abovementioned opinion, which he obstinately refused to do, and was, on this account, excommunicated and deposed; little disposed, however, to acquiesce in this sentence, he appealed to the decision of a general council.

The council, which was called *Conventus Latronum.*

XIV. In consequence of this appeal, the emperor THEODOSIUS assembled an *œcumenical council* at *Ephesus*, A. D. 449, at the head of which he placed DIOSCORUS, bishop of *Alexandria*, the successor of CYRIL, the faithful imitator of his arrogance and fury, and a declared enemy to the bishop of *Constantinople*. Accordingly, by the influence and caballing of this turbulent man, matters were carried on in this council with the same want of equity and decency that had dishonoured a former Ephesian council, and characterised the proceedings of CYRIL against NESTORIUS. For DIOSCORUS, in whose church a doctrine almost the same with that of the Eutychians was constantly taught, confounded matters with such artifice and dexterity, that the doctrine of *one incarnate nature* triumphed, and EUTYCHES was acquitted of the charge of error that had been brought against him. FLAVIANUS, on the other

nion, that the Book, in which it is found, has been falsely attributed to him. See MICH. LE QUIEN, *Dissert.* ii. *in Damascenum*, p. 31. CHRIST. AUG. SALIG, *De Eutychianismo ante Eutichen*, p. 112. It appears, by what we read in the *Biblioth. Oriental.* &c. of ASSEMAN. tom. i. p. 219, that the Syrians expressed themselves in this manner before EUTYCHES, though without designing thereby to broach any new doctrine, but rather without well knowing what they said. We stand yet in need of a solid and accurate history of the Eutychian troubles; notwithstanding the labours of the learned SALIG upon that subject.

hand,

hand, was, by the order of this unrighteous council, publicly ſcourged in the moſt barbarous manner, and baniſhed to *Epipas*, a city of *Lydia*, where ſoon after he ended his days [*b*]. The Greeks called this Epheſian council, a band, or *aſſembly of robbers*, σύνοδον ληστρικὴν, to ſignify that every thing was carried in it by fraud or violence [*c*]. And many councils, indeed, both in this and the following ages, are equally intitled to the ſame diſhonourable appellation.

The council of *Chalcedon*.

XV. The face of affairs ſoon changed, and aſſumed an aſpect utterly unfavourable to the party whom the Epheſian council had rendered triumphant. FLAVIANUS and his followers not only engaged LEO the GREAT, biſhop of *Rome*, in their intereſts (for the Roman Pontif was the ordinary refuge of the oppreſſed and conquered party in this century), but alſo remonſtrated to the emperor, that a matter of ſuch an arduous and important nature required, in order to its deciſion, a council compoſed out of the church univerſal. LEO ſeconded this latter requeſt, demanded of THEODOSIUS a general council, which no entreaties could perſuade this emperor to grant. Upon his death, however, his ſucceſſor MARCIAN conſented to LEO's demand, and called, in the year 451, the council of *Chalcedon* [*d*], which is reckoned the *fourth general*, or *œcumenical*

[*b*] See the *Concilia* Jo. HARDUINI, tom. i. p. 82. LIBERATI *Breviarium*, cap. xii. p. 76. LEONIS M. *Epiſt.* xciii. p. 625. NICEPHORI *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtic.* lib. xiv. cap. lxvii. p. 550, &c.

☞ [*c*] Though FLAVIANUS died ſoon after the council of *Epheſus*, of the bruiſes he had received from DIOSCORUS, and the other biſhops of his party in that horrid aſſembly, yet, before his death, he had appealed to LEO; and this appeal, purſued by LEO, occaſioned the council, in which EUTYCHES was condemned, and the bloody DIOSCORUS depoſed.

☞ [*d*] This council was, by the emperor's ſummons, firſt aſſembled at *Nice*, but afterwards removed to *Chalcedon*; that

CENT. V. PART II.

œcumenical council. The legates of LEO, who, in his famous letter to FLAVIANUS, had already condemned the Eutychian doctrine, presided in this grand and crowded assembly. DIOSCORUS was condemned, deposed, and banished into *Paphlagonia*, the acts of the council of *Ephesus* were annulled, the *epistle* of LEO received as a rule of faith [*e*]; EUTYCHES, who had been already sent into banishment, and deprived of his sacerdotal dignity by the emperor, was now condemned, though absent; and the following doctrine, which is at this time almost generally received, was inculcated upon CHRISTIANS as the object of faith, *viz.* "That in CHRIST *two distinct natures* were "united, in *one person*, and that without any "change, mixture, or confusion."

Warm contests succeed the council of *Coalcedon.*

XVI. The remedy applied by this council, to heal the wounds of a torn and divided church, proved really worse than the disease. For a great number of Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though of various characters and different opinions in other respects, united in opposing, with the utmost vehemence, the council of *Chalcedon* and the *epistle of* LEO, which it had adopted as a rule of faith, and were unanimous in maintaining an *unity* of *nature*, as well as of *person*, in JESUS CHRIST. Hence arose deplorable discords and civil wars, whose fury and barbarity were carried

the emperor, who, on account of the irruption of the Hunns into *Illyricum*, was unwilling to go far from *Constantinople*, might assist at it in person.

☞ [*e*] This was the Letter which LEO had written to FLAVIANUS, after having been informed by him of what had passed in the council of *Constantinople*. In this epistle, LEO approves of the decisions of that council, declares the doctrine of EUTYCHES heretical and impious, explains, with great appearance of perspicuity, the doctrine of the Catholic church upon this perplexed subject; so that this letter was esteemed a masterpiece both of logic and eloquence, and was constantly read, during the *Advent*, in the western churches.

to

to the moſt exceſſive and incredible lengths. Upon the death of the emperor MARCIAN, the populace aſſembled tumultuouſly in *Egypt*, maſſacred PROTERIUS, the ſucceſſor of DIOSCORUS, and ſubſtituted in his place TIMOTHEUS ÆLURUS, who was a zealous defender of the Eutychian doctrine of *one incarnate nature* in CHRIST. This latter, indeed, was depoſed and baniſhed by the emperor LEO; but, upon his death, was reſtored by BASILICUS both to his liberty and epiſcopal dignity. After the death of ÆLURUS, the defenders of the council of *Chalcedon* choſe in his place TIMOTHEUS, ſurnamed SALOPHACIOLUS, while the partiſans of the Eutychian doctrine of the *one nature*, elected ſchiſmatically PETER MOGGUS to the ſame dignity. An edict of the emperor ZENO obliged the latter to yield. The triumph, however, of the Chalcedonians, on this occaſion, was but tranſitory; for, upon the death of TIMOTHEUS, JOHN TALAIA, whom they had choſen in his place, was removed by the ſame emperor [*f*]; and MOGGUS, or MONGUS, by an imperial edict, and the favour of ACACIUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, was, in the year 482, raiſed to the ſee of *Alexandria*.

Conteſts in Syria and Armenia.

XVII. The abbot BARSUMAS (whom the reader muſt be careful not to confound with BARSUMAS of *Niſibis*, the famous promoter of the Neſtorian doctrines) having been condemned by the council of *Chalcedon* [*g*], brought the Eutychian opinions into *Syria*, and, by the miniſtry of his diſ-

[*f*] See LIBERATI *Breviarium*, cap. xvi, xvii, xviii. EVAGR. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. viii. lib. iii. cap. iii. LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 410.

☞ [*g*] The BARSUMAS, here mentioned, was he who aſſiſted the biſhop of *Alexandria* (DIOSCORUS) and the ſoldiers, in beating FLAVIANUS to death in the council of *Epheſus*, and, to ſhun whoſe fury, the Orthodox biſhops were forced to creep into holes, and hide themſelves under benches, in that *pious aſſembly*.

ciple

CENT. V. PART II.

ciple SAMUEL, ſpread them amongſt the Armenians about the year 460. This doctrine, however, as it was commonly explained, had ſomething ſo harſh and ſhocking in it, that the Syrians were eaſily engaged to abandon it by the exhortations of XENAIAS, otherwiſe called PHILOXENUS, biſhop of *Hierapolis*, and the famous PETER FULLO. Theſe doctors rejected the opinion, attributed to EUTYCHES, that *the human nature of* CHRIST *was abſorbed by the divine* [*h*], and modified matters ſo as to form the following hypotheſis: "That in the ſon of God there was *one* "*nature*, which, notwithſtanding its *unity*, was "*double* and *compounded*." This notion was not leſs repugnant to the deciſions of the council of *Chalcedon* than the Eutychian doctrine, and was therefore ſtedfaſtly oppoſed by thoſe who acknowledged the authority of that council [*i*].

The troubles excited by Peter the Fuller.

XVIII. PETER, ſurnamed FULLO, from the trade of a fuller, which he exerciſed in his monaſtic ſtate, had uſurped the ſee of *Antioch*, and, after having been ſeveral times depoſed and condemned on account of the bitterneſs of his oppoſition to the council of *Chalcedon*, was fixed in it, at laſt, A. D. 482, by the authority of the emperor ZENO, and the favour of ACACIUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople* [*k*]. This troubleſome and con-

☞ [*h*] EUTYCHES never affirmed what is here attributed to him; he maintained ſimply, that the *two natures*, which exiſted in CHRIST before his incarnation, became *one* after it by the *hypoſtatical union*. This miſerable diſpute about words was nouriſhed by the contending parties having no clear ideas of the terms *perſon* and *nature*; as alſo by an invincible ignorance of the ſubject in diſpute.

[*i*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vat.* tom. ii. p. 1—10. See alſo the *Diſſertation* of this author, *De Monophyſitis*, which is prefixed to this volume.

[*k*] VALESII *Diſſertatio de* PET. FULLONE, *et de Synodis adverſus eum collectis*, which is added to the third volume of the *Scriptor. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* p. 173.

tentious

tentious man excited new diſcords in the church, and ſeemed ambitious of forming a new ſect under the name of Theopaſchites [*l*]; for to the words, *O God moſt holy*, &c. in the famous hymn which the Greeks called *Triſagium*, he ordered the following phraſe to be added in the eaſtern churches, *who haſt ſuffered for us upon the croſs*. His deſign in this was manifeſtly to raiſe a new ſect, and alſo to fix more deeply, in the minds of the people, the doctrine of *one nature in* CHRIST, to which he was zealouſly attached. His adverſaries, and eſpecially FELIX the Roman pontif, interpreted this addition to the hymn abovementioned in a quite different manner, and charged him with maintaining, that all the three perſons of the Godhead were crucified: and hence thoſe who approved of his addition were called Theopaſchites. The conſequence of this diſpute was, that the weſtern Chriſtians rejected the addition inſerted by FULLO, which they judged relative to the whole trinity; while the Orientals uſed it conſtantly after this period, and that without giving the leaſt offence, becauſe they applied it to CHRIST alone [*m*].

XIX. To put an end to this controverſy, which had produced the moſt unhappy diviſions both in church and ſtate, the emperor ZENO, by the advice of ACACIUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, publiſhed, A. D. 482, the famous *Henoticon*, or *Decree of union*, which was deſigned to reconcile the contending parties. This *decree* repeated and confirmed all that had been enacted in the councils of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople*, *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon*, The *Henoticon* of Zeno.

☞ [*l*] This word expreſſes the enormous error of thoſe frantic doctors, who imagined that the Godhead ſuffered in and with CHRIST.

[*m*] See Norris, *Lib. de uno ex Trinitate carne paſſo*, tom. iii. opp. *Diſſ.* i. cap. iii. p. 782. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 518. tom. ii. p. 36. 180.

CENT. V. PART II.

againſt the Arians, Neſtorians, and Eutychians, without making any particular mention of the council of *Chalcedon* [n]. For ACACIUS had perſuaded the emperor, that the preſent oppoſition was not carried on againſt the decrees that had paſſed in the council of *Chalcedon*, but againſt the council itſelf; with reſpect to which, therefore, an entire ſilence was undoubtedly prudent in a propoſal, which, inſtead of reviving, was deſigned to put an end to all diſputes, and to reconcile the moſt jarring principles.

In the mean time MONGUS and FULLO, who filled the ſees of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and headed the ſect of the Monophyſites [o], ſubſcribed this *Decree of union*, which was alſo approved by ACACIUS of *Conſtantinople*, and by all thoſe of the two contending parties who were at all remarkable for their candour and moderation. But there were on all ſides violent and obſtinate bigots, who oppoſed, with vigour, theſe pacific meaſures, and complained of the Henoticon as injurious to the honour and authority of the moſt holy council of *Chalcedon* [p]. Hence aroſe new conteſts and new diviſions not leſs deplorable than thoſe which the *Decree of union* was deſigned to ſuppreſs.

Produces new conteſts among the Eutychians.

XX. A conſiderable body of the Monophyſites, or Eutychians, looked upon the conduct of MONGUS, who had ſubſcribed the *decree*, as highly criminal, and conſequently formed themſelves into a new faction, under the title of Acephali, i. e. *headleſs*, becauſe, by the ſubmiſſion of MON-

[n] EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iii. cap. xiv. LIBERATI *Breviarium Hiſt.* cap. xviii.

☞ [o] This word expreſſes the doctrine of thoſe who believed, that in CHRIST there was but *one nature*, and is, in moſt reſpects, the ſame with the term *Eutychians*.

[p] See FACUNDUS HERMIAN. *Defenſ. trium Capitulor.* lib. xii. cap. iv.

GUS,

GUS, they had been deprived of their chief [q]. This ſect was afterwards divided into three others, who were called Anthropomorphites, Barſanuphites, and Eſaianiſts; and theſe again, in the following century, were the unhappy occaſion of new factions, of which the antient writers make frequent mention [r]. It is however neceſſary to obſerve here, for the information of thoſe, whoſe curioſity intereſts them in inquiries of this nature, that theſe ſubdiviſions of the Eutychian ſect are not to be adopted with too much facility. Some of them are entirely fictitious; others are characteriſed by a nominal, and not by a real difference; the diviſion is in *words*, and not in *things*; while a third ſort are diſtinguiſhed, not by their peculiar doctrines, but by certain rites and inſtitutions, and matters of a merely circumſtantial nature. Be that as it will, theſe numerous branches of the Eutychian faction did not flouriſh long; they declined gradually in the following century; and the influence and authority of the famous BARADÆUS contributed principally to their total extinction by the union he eſtabliſhed among the numbers of that ſect.

XXI. The Roman pontif, FELIX II. having aſſembled an Italian council, compoſed of ſixty-ſeven biſhops, condemned, depoſed, and cut off, from the communion of the church, ACACIUS biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, as a perfidious enemy to the truth. Several articles were alleged againſt ACACIUS, to furniſh a pretext for the ſeverity of this ſentence; ſuch as his attachment to the Mo-

And alſo among the partiſans of the council of *Chalcedon*.

[q] EVAGR. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iii. cap. xiii. LEONTIUS BYZANT. *De ſectis*, tom. i. *Lection. Antiq.* CANISII, p. 537. TIMOTH. *in* COTELERII *Monument. Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 409.

[r] Theſe ſects are enumerated by BASNAGE, in his *Prolegom. ad* HEN. CANISII *Léction. Antiqu.* cap. iii. and by ASSEMAN, in his *Diſſertatio de Monophyſitis*, p. 7.

 nophyſites,

nophyſites, and their leaders MONGUS and FULLO, the contempt with which he treated the council of *Chalcedon*, and other accuſations of a like nature. But the true reaſons of theſe proceedings, and of the irreconcileable hatred which the Roman pontifs indulged againſt ACACIUS, were his denying the ſupremacy of the biſhop of *Rome*, his oppoſing it throughout the whole courſe of his miniſtry [*s*], and his ambitious efforts to enlarge beyond all bounds the authority and prerogatives of the ſee of *Conſtantinople*. The Greeks, however, defended the character and memory of their biſhop againſt all the aſperſions which were caſt upon him by the Romans. Hence aroſe a new ſchiſm, and new conteſts, which were carried on with great violence until the following century, when the obſtinacy and perſeverance of the Latins triumphed over the oppoſition of the oriental Chriſtians, and brought about an agreement, in conſequence of which, the names of ACACIUS and FULLO were ſtruck out of the *dip-*

☞ [*s*] This again is one of the periods of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, in which we find a multitude of events, which are ſo many proofs how far the ſupremacy of the biſhop of *Rome* was from being univerſally acknowledged. Pope FELIX II. depoſes and excommunicates ACACIUS the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who not only receives this ſentence with contempt, but, in his turn, anathematizes and excommunicates the Pope and orders his name to be ſtruck out of the *diptychs*. This conduct of ACACIUS is approved by the emperor, the church of *Conſtantinople*, by almoſt all the eaſtern biſhops, nay, by even ANDREAS of *Theſſalonica*, who was at that time the pope's vicar for *Eaſt Illyricum*. This was the occaſion of that general ſchiſm, which continued for the ſpace of twenty-five years, between the eaſtern and weſtern churches. It is here worthy of obſervation, that the eaſtern biſhops did not adhere to the cauſe of ACACIUS from any other principle, as appears from the moſt authentic records of thoſe times, than a perſuaſion of the illegality of his excommunication by the Roman pontif, who, in their judgment, had not a right to depoſe the firſt biſhop of the eaſt, without the conſent of a general council.

tychs,

tychs, or ſacred regiſters, and thus branded with perpetual infamy [*t*].

The doctrines of Eutyches and the Monophyſites.

XXII. Theſe deplorable diſſenſions and conteſts had, for their object, a matter of the ſmalleſt importance. EUTYCHES was generally ſuppoſed to have maintained, "That the *divine nature* of "CHRIST had abſorbed the *human*, and that, conſequently, in him there was but *one nature*, viz. "the *divine*;" but the truth of this ſuppoſition is as yet deſtitute of ſufficient evidence. However that may have been, this opinion, as alſo EUTYCHES its pretended author, were rejected and condemned by thoſe who oppoſed the council of *Chalcedon*, and principally indeed by XENAIAS and FULLO, who are, therefore, improperly called Eutychians, and belong rather to the claſs of the Monophyſites. They, who aſſumed this latter title, held, "That the *divine* and *human nature* of "CHRIST were ſo united, as to form only *one nature*, "yet, without any *change*, *confuſion*, or *mixture* "of the two natures:" and that this caution might be carefully obſerved, and their meaning be well underſtood, they frequently expreſſed themſelves thus: "In CHRIST there is one na"ture; but that nature is two-fold and com"pounded [*u*]." They diſowned all relation and attachment to EUTYCHES; but regarded, with the higheſt veneration, DIOSCORUS, BARSUMAS, XENAIAS, and FULLO, as the pillars of their ſect; and rejected not only the *Epiſtle* of LEO, but alſo

[*t*] HEN. VALESIUS, *Diſſert. de ſynodis Roman. in quibus damnatus eſt Acacius, ad calcem*, tom. iii. *Scriptor. Eccl.* p. 179, BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 301, 380, 381. BAYLE's *Dictionary* in Engliſh, at the article ACACIUS. DAVID BLONDEL, *De la Primauté dans l'Egliſe*, p. 279. *Acta ſanctorum*, tom. iii. Februar. p. 502.

[*u*] See the paſſages drawn from the writings of the Monophyſites by the moſt learned, and, frequently, impartial ASSEMAN, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. p. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135, 277, 297, &c.

CENT. V. PART II.

the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon*. The opinion of the Monophyſites, if we judge of it by the terms in which it is here delivered, does not ſeem to differ in reality, but only in the manner of expreſſion, from that which was eſtabliſhed by the council of *Chalcedon* [*w*]. But, if we attend carefully to the Metaphyſical arguments and ſubtilties which the former employ to confirm their doctrine[*x*], we ſhall, perhaps, be induced to think that the controverſy between the Monophyſites and Chalcedonians is not merely a diſpute about words.

The Pelagian controverſy.

XXIII. A new controverſy aroſe in the church during this century, and its peſtilential effects extended themſelves through the following ages. The authors of it were PELAGIUS and CÆLESTIUS, both monks; the former a *Briton*; and the latter a native of *Ireland* [*y*]: they lived at *Rome* in the greateſt reputation, and were univerſally eſteemed on account of their extraordinary piety and virtue [*z*]. Theſe monks looked upon the doctrines, which

[*w*] Many learned men treat this controverſy as a mere diſpute about words. GREGORY ABULPHARAIUS, himſelf a Monophyſite, and the moſt learned of the ſect, declares this as his opinion. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. ii. p. 291. Add to this the *Biblioth. Italique*, tom. xvii. p. 285. LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme des Indes*, p. 23. and *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme d' Ethiope*, p. 14. ASSEMAN, though a Roman by birth and by religion, ſeems, in a good meaſure, to have adopted the ſame way of thinking, as appears by p. 297. of the tome quoted above.

[*x*] See the ſubtile argumentation of ABULPHARAIUS, in the *Biblioth. Orient.* of ASSEMAN, tom. ii. p. 288.

☞ [*y*] Nothing very certain can be advanced with reſpect to the native country of CÆLESTIUS, which ſome ſay was *Scotland*, and others *Campania* in *Italy*. We know, however, that he was deſcended of an illuſtrious family; and that, after having applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the law for ſome time, he retired from the world, and embraced the monaſtic life. See GENNAD. *De Script. Eccleſiaſt.* cap. xliv.

☞ [*z*] The learned and furious JEROM, who never once thought of doing common juſtice to thoſe who had the misfortune

which were commonly received, "*Concerning the* "*original corruption of human nature*, and *the ne-* "*ceſſity of divine grace to enlighten the underſtand-* "*ing, and purify the heart*, as prejudicial to the "progreſs of holineſs and virtue, and tending to "lull mankind in a preſumptuous and fatal ſecu- "rity. They maintained, that theſe doctrines "were as falſe as they were pernicious; that the "ſins of our *firſt parents* were *imputed* to *them* "alone, and not to their *poſterity*; that we derive "no *corruption* from their fall, but are born as "pure and unſpotted as ADAM came out of the "forming hand of his creator; that mankind, "therefore, are capable of repentance and amend- "ment; and of arriving to the higheſt degrees "of piety and virtue by the uſe of their natural "faculties and powers; that, indeed, *external* "*grace* is neceſſary to excite their endeavours, but "that they have no need of the *internal* ſuccours "of the divine ſpirit." Theſe notions, and ſome others intimately connected with them [*a*], were propagated at *Rome*, though in a private manner, by the two monks already mentioned, who, retiring from that city, A. D. 410, upon the approach of the Goths, went firſt into *Sicily*, and afterwards into *Africa*, where they publiſhed their

fortune to differ from him in opinion, accuſed PELAGIUS of gluttony and intemperance, after he had heard of his errors, though he had admired him before for his exemplary virtue. AUGUSTIN, more candid and honeſt, bears impartial teſtimony to the truth; and even while he writes againſt this heretic, acknowledges that he had made great progreſs in virtue and piety, that his life was chaſte and his manners blameleſs; and this, indeed, is the truth of the matter.

☞ [*a*] The doctrines, that were more immediately connected with the main principles of PELAGIUS, were, that *infant baptiſm* was not a *ſign* or *ſeal* of the *remiſſion of ſins*, but a *mark* of admiſſion to the *kingdom of heaven*, which was only open to the pure in heart; that *good works* were *meritorious*, and the only conditions of ſalvation, with many others too tedious to mention.

CENT. V. PART II.

doctrine with more freedom. From *Africa* PELAGIUS paſſed into *Paleſtine*, while CÆLESTIUS remained at *Carthage* with a view to preferment, deſiring to be admitted among the preſbyters of that city. But the diſcovery of his opinions having blaſted his hopes, and his errors being condemned in a council held at *Carthage* A. D. 412, he departed from that city, and went into the eaſt. It was from this time that AUGUSTIN, the famous biſhop of *Hippo*, began to attack the tenets of PELAGIUS and CÆLESTIUS in his learned and eloquent writings; and to him, indeed, is principally due the glory of having ſuppreſſed this ſect in its very birth [*b*].

The progreſs of this controverſy

XXIV. Things went more ſmoothly with PELAGIUS in the eaſt, where he enjoyed the protection and favour of JOHN, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, whoſe attachment to the ſentiments of ORIGEN led him naturally to countenance thoſe of PELAGIUS, on account of the conformity that there ſeemed to be between theſe two ſyſtems. Under the ſhadow of this powerful protection, PELAGIUS made a public profeſſion of his opinions, and formed diſciples in ſeveral places. And though in the year 415, he was accuſed by OROSIUS, a Spaniſh preſbyter, whom AUGUSTIN had ſent into *Paleſtine* for that purpoſe, before an aſſembly of biſhops met at *Jeruſalem*, yet he was diſmiſſed without the leaſt cenſure; and not only

[*b*] The Pelagian controverſy has been hiſtorically treated by many learned writers, ſuch as USHER, in his *Antiquit. Eccleſ. Britannicæ*; LAET; GER. VOSSIUS; NORIS; GARNIER, in his *Supplement. Oper. Theodoreti*; JANSENIUS *in Auguſtino*; and others. LONGUEVAL alſo, a French Jeſuit, wrote *A Hiſtory of the Pelagians*. See the Preface to the ninth vol. of his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ*, p. 4. After all, it muſt be confeſſed, that of all theſe learned writers none have exhauſted this intereſting ſubject, or treated it with a ſufficient degree of impartiality.

ſo,

ſo, but was ſoon after fully acquitted of all errors by the council of *Dioſpolis* [*c*].

This controverſy was brought to *Rome*, and referred by CÆLESTIUS and PELAGIUS to the deciſion of ZOSIMUS [*d*], who was raiſed to the Pontificate A. D. 417. The new Pontif, gained over by the ambiguous and ſeemingly orthodox *confeſſion of faith*, that CÆLESTIUS, who was now at *Rome*, had artfully drawn up, and alſo by the letters and proteſtations of PELAGIUS, pronounced in favour of theſe monks, declared them found in the faith, and unjuſtly perſecuted by their adverſaries. The African biſhops, with AUGUSTIN at their head, little affected with this declaration, continued obſtinately to maintain the judgment they had pronounced in this matter, and to ſtrengthen it by their exhortations, their letters, and their writings. ZOSIMUS yielded to the perſeverance of the Africans, changed his mind, and condemned, with the utmoſt ſeverity, PELAGIUS and CÆLESTIUS, whom he had honoured with his approbation, and covered with his protection. This was followed by a train of evils, which purſued theſe two monks without interruption. They were condemned by that ſame Epheſian council which had launched its thunder at the head of NESTORIUS: in ſhort, the Gauls, Britons, and

[*c*] See DANIEL, *Hiſtoire du Concile de Dioſpolis*, which is to be found in the *Opuſcula* of that eloquent and learned Jeſuit, publiſhed at Paris in the year 1724, in three volumes quarto. *Dioſpolis* was a city of *Paleſtine*, known in ſcripture by the name of *Lydda*; and the biſhop, who preſided in this council, was EULOGIUS of *Cæſarea*, Metropolitan of *Paleſtine*.

☞ [*d*] To preſerve the thread of the hiſtory here, and prevent the reader's being ſurpriſed to find PELAGIUS and CÆLESTIUS appealing to *Rome* after having been acquitted at *Dioſpolis*, it is neceſſary to obſerve, that, after the council of *Dioſpolis*, theſe two monks were condemned anew, A.D. 416, by the African biſhops aſſembled at *Carthage*, and thoſe of *Numidia* aſſembled at *Milevum*; upon which they appealed to *Rome*.

Africans,

Africans, by their councils, and the emperors, by their edicts and penal laws, demoliſhed this ſect in its infancy, and ſuppreſſed it entirely before it had acquired any tolerable degree of vigour or conſiſtence [*e*].

The predeſtinarians.

XXV. The unhappy diſputes about the opinions of PELAGIUS occaſioned, as uſually happens, other controverſies equally prejudicial to the peace of the church, and the intereſts of true Chriſtianity. In the courſe of this diſpute, AUGUSTIN had delivered his opinion, *Concerning the neceſſity of divine grace in order to our ſalvation, and the decrees of God with reſpect to the future conditions of men*, without being always conſiſtent with himſelf, or intelligible to others. Hence certain monks of *Adrumetum*, and others, were led into a notion, "That God not only predeſtinated the "wicked to eternal puniſhment, but alſo to the "guilt and tranſgreſſion for which they are pu-"niſhed; and that thus both the good and bad "actions of all men were determined from eter-"nity by a divine decree, and fixed by an invin-"cible neceſſity." Thoſe who embraced this opinion, were called Predeſtinarians. AUGUSTIN uſed his utmoſt influence and authority to prevent the ſpreading of this doctrine, and explained his true ſentiments with more perſpicuity, that it might not be attributed to him. His efforts were ſeconded by the councils of *Arles* and *Lions*, in which the doctrine in queſtion was pub-

[*e*] See GERARD. JO. VOSSIUS, his *Hiſtoria Pelagiana*, lib. i. cap. lv. p. 130.; as alſo the learned obſervations that have been made upon this controverſy, in the *Bibliotheque Italique*, tom. v. p. 74. The writers on both ſides are mentioned by JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, in his *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. 1671. The learned WALL, in his *Hiſtory of Infant Baptiſm*, vol. i. chap. xix. has given a conciſe and elegant account of the Pelagian controverſy; an account which, though imperfect in ſeveral reſpects, abounds with ſolid and uſeful erudition.

lickly

lickly rejected and condemned [*f*]. But we muſt not omit obſerving, that the exiſtence of this Predeſtinarian ſect has been denied by many learned men, and looked upon as an invention of the Semi-Pelagians, deſigned to decry the followers of AUGUSTIN, by attributing to them unjuſtly this dangerous and pernicious error [*g*].

Semi-Pelagians.

XXVI. A new and different modification was given to the doctrine of AUGUSTIN by the monk CASSIAN, who came from the eaſt into *France*, and erected a monaſtery near *Marſeille*. Nor was he the only one who attempted to fix upon a certain temperature between the errors of PELAGIUS and the opinions of the African oracle; ſeveral perſons embarked in this undertaking about the year 430, and hence aroſe a new ſect, which were called, by their adverſaries, Semi-Pelagians.

The opinions of this ſect have been miſrepreſented, by its enemies, upon ſeveral occaſions; ſuch is generally the fate of all parties in religi-

[*f*] See JAC. SERMONDI *Hiſtoria Prædeſtinatiana*, tom. iv. opp. p. 271. BASNAGE *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. ii. p. 698. DION. PETAVIUS, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. vi. p. 168. 174, &c.

[*g*] See GILB. MAUGUINI *Fabula Prædeſtinatiana confutata*, which he ſubjoined to the ſecond tome of his learned work, intitled, *Collectio variorum Scriptorum qui Sæc.* ix. *de Prædeſtinatione et Gratia ſcripſerunt.* FRED. SPANHEMIUS, *Introd. ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſ.* tom. i. opp. p. 993. JAC. BASNAG. *Adnot. ad Proſperi Chronicon & Præf. ad Fauſtum Regienſem*, tom. i. *Lection. Antiqu.* HEN. CANISII, p. 315. 348. GRANET (who wrote the life of LAUNOY) obſerves, that SIRMOND had ſolicited LAUNOY to write againſt MAUGUIN, who denied the exiſtence of the *Prædeſtinarian ſect*; but that the former, having examined the matter with care and application, adopted the ſentiment of MAUGUIN. The whole diſpute about the exiſtence of this ſect will, when cloſely looked into, appear to be little more perhaps than a diſpute about words. ☞ It may be very true, that about this time, nay, from the time of St. PAUL, certain perſons embraced the Predeſtinarian opinions here mentioned. But there is no ſolid proof, that the abettors of theſe opinions ever formed themſelves into a ſect. See BASNAGE *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 700.

CENT. V. PART II.

ous controverſies. Their doctrine, as it has been generally explained by the learned, amounted to this: "That *inward preventing grace* was not neceſſary to form in the ſoul the *firſt beginnings* of "true repentance and amendment; that every "one was capable of producing theſe by the mere "power of their natural faculties, as alſo of exerciſing faith in CHRIST, and forming the purpoſes of a holy and ſincere obedience." But they acknowledged at the ſame time, "That "none could *perſevere* or *advance* in that holy and "virtuous courſe, which they had the power of "*beginning*, without the perpetual ſupport, and "the powerful aſſiſtance of the divine grace [*b*]." The diſciples of AUGUSTIN, in *Gaul*, attacked the Semi-Pelagians with the utmoſt vehemence, without being able to extirpate or overcome them [*i*]. The doctrine of this ſect was ſo ſuited to the capacities of the generality of men, ſo conformable to the way of thinking that prevailed among the monaſtic orders, ſo well received among the graveſt and moſt learned Grecian doctors, that neither the zeal nor induſtry of its adverſa-

☞ [*b*] The leading principles of the Semi-Pelagians were the five following: 1. That God did not diſpenſe his *grace* to one more than another, in conſequence of Predeſtination, *i.e.* an eternal and abſolute decree, but was willing to ſave all men, if they complied with the terms of his goſpel. 2. That CHRIST *died for all men.* 3. That the grace purchaſed by CHRIST, and neceſſary to ſalvation, was offered to all men. 4. That man, before he received grace, was capable of faith and holy deſires. 5. That man born *free*, was conſequently capable of reſiſting the influences of grace, or *complying* with its ſuggeſtions. See BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. 1. p. 696, &c.

[*i*] JAC. BASNAGE, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. i. *Hiſt Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. *Præf.* p. 9. VOSSII *Hiſtor. Pelagiana*, lib. v. p. 538. SCIPIO MAFFEI (under the fictitious name of IRENÆUS VERONENSIS) *De Hæreſi Pelagiana in tomo* xxix. *Opuſcul. Scientif.* ANGELI *Calogeræ*, p. 399.

ries

ries could ſtop its rapid and extenſive progreſs. Add to its other advantages, that neither AUGUSTIN, nor his followers, had ventured to condemn it in all its parts, nor to brand it as an impious and pernicious hereſy.

Various controverſies concerning grace.

XXVII. This was the commencement of thoſe unhappy conteſts, thoſe ſubtile and perplexing diſputes concerning grace, or the nature and operation of that divine power, which is eſſentially required in order to ſalvation, that rent the church into the moſt deplorable diviſions through the whole courſe of the ſucceeding age, and which, to the deep ſorrow and regret of every true and generous Chriſtian, have been continued down to the preſent time. The doctrine of AUGUSTIN, who was of opinion that, in the work of converſion and ſanctification, all was to be attributed to a divine energy, and nothing to human agency, had many followers in all ages of the church; though his diſciples have never been entirely agreed about the manner of explaining what he taught upon that head [*k*]. The followers of CASSIAN were, however, much more numerous, and his doctrine, though variouſly explained, was received in the greateſt part of the monaſtic ſchools in *Gaul*, from whence it ſpread itſelf far and wide through the European provinces. As to the Greeks and other eaſtern chriſtians, they had embraced the Semi-Pelagian doctrine before CASSIAN, and ſtill adhere firmly to it. The generality of chriſtians looked upon the opinions of

☞ [*k*] It is well known that the Janſeniſts and Jeſuits both plead the authority of St. AUGUSTIN, in behalf of their oppoſite ſyſtems with reſpect to predeſtination and grace. This knotty doctrine has exerciſed ſeverely the pretended infallibility of the popes, and expoſed it to the laughter of the wiſe upon many occaſions; and the famous *Bull Unigenitus*, which of late years has made ſuch noiſe, ſet CLEMENT XI. in direct oppoſition with ſeveral of the moſt celebrated Roman pontifs. Which are we to believe?

PELAGIUS

CENT. V. PART II.

PELAGIUS as daring and preſumptuous; and even to thoſe who adopted them in ſecret, they appeared too free and too far removed from the notions commonly received, to render the public profeſſion of them adviſeable and prudent. Certain however it is that in all ages of the church there have been ſeveral perſons, who, in conformity with the doctrine attributed to this heretic, have believed mankind endowed with a *natural power* of paying to the divine laws a *perfect obedience.*

THE SIXTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the church during this century.

The progreſs of the Chriſtian religion in the eaſt.

I. THE zeal of the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, ſeconded by the protection and influence of the Grecian emperors, increaſed the number of Chriſtians in the eaſt, and contributed to the converſion of ſome barbarous nations, of thoſe, particularly, who lived upon the borders of the *Euxine* ſea, as appears by the moſt authentic records of Grecian hiſtory. Among theſe nations were the Abaſgi, who inhabited the country lying between the coaſts of the *Euxine* ſea, and mount *Caucaſus*, and who embraced Chriſtianity under the reign of JUSTINIAN [*a*]; the Heruli, who dwelt beyond the *Danube*, and who were converted under the ſame reign [*b*]; as alſo the Alans, Lazi, and Zani, with other uncivilized countries, whoſe ſituation, at this time, is only known by vague and imper-

[*a*] PROCOPIUS, *De bello Gothico*, lib. iv. cap. iii. LE QUIN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1351.

[*b*] PROCOPIUS, l. c. lib. ii. cap. xiv.

fect

fect conjectures. Theſe converſions, indeed, however pompouſly they may ſound, were extremely ſuperficial and imperfect, as we learn from the moſt credible accounts that have been given of them. All that was required of theſe darkened nations amounted to an oral profeſſion of their faith in CHRIST, to their abſtaining from ſacrificing to the gods, and their committing to memory certain forms of doctrine; while little care was taken to enrich their minds with pious ſentiments, or to cultivate in their hearts virtuous affections. So that, even after their converſion to Chriſtianity, they retained their primitive ferocity and ſavage manners, and continued to diſtinguiſh themſelves by the moſt horrid acts of cruelty and rapine, and the practice of all ſorts of wickedneſs. In the greateſt part of the Grecian provinces, and even in the capital of the eaſtern empire, there were ſtill multitudes who preſerved a ſecret attachment to the Pagan religion. Of theſe vaſt numbers were brought over to Chriſtianity under the reign of JUSTIN, by the miniſterial labours of JOHN, biſhop of *Aſia* [*c*].

In the weſt. II. In the weſtern parts, REMIGIUS, or REMI, biſhop of *Rheims*, who is commonly called *The apoſtle of the Gauls*, ſignalized his zeal in the converſion of thoſe who ſtill adhered to the antient ſuperſtitions [*d*]; and his ſucceſs was conſiderable, particularly after that auſpicious period when CLOVIS, king of the Franks, embraced the goſpel.

In *Britain*, ſeveral circumſtances concurred to favour the propagation of Chriſtianity. ETHELBERT, king of *Kent*, and the moſt conſider-

[*c*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNUS. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. ii. p. 85.

[*d*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 155.

able of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs, among whom that iſland was at this time divided, married BERTHA, daughter of CHEREBERT, king of *Paris*, towards the concluſion of this century. This princeſs, partly by her own influence, and partly by the pious efforts of the clergy, who followed her into *Britain*, gradually formed, in the mind of ETHELBERT, a certain inclination to the Chriſtian religion. While the king was in this favourable diſpoſition, GREGORY the GREAT ſent into *Britain*, A. D. 596, forty Benedictine monks, with AUGUSTIN at their head [*e*], in order to bring to perfection what the pious queen had ſo happily begun. This monk, ſeconded by the zeal and aſſiſtance of BERTHA, converted the king, and the greateſt part of the inhabitants of *Kent*, and laid anew the foundations of the Britiſh church [*f*].

The labours of COLUMBAS, an Iriſh monk, were attended with ſucceſs among the Picts and Scots, many of whom embraced the goſpel of CHRIST [*g*].

In *Germany*, the Bohemians, Thuringians, and Boii, are ſaid to have abandoned, in this century, their antient ſuperſtitions [*b*], and to have re-

☞ [*e*] This Britiſh apoſtle was prior of the monaſtery of St. ANDREW, of the order of St. BENEDICT, at *Rome*. After his arrival in *England*, he converted the heathen temples into places of Chriſtian worſhip, erected *Chriſt-church* into a cathedral, opened a ſeminary of learning, founded the abbey of St. AUGUSTIN, received epiſcopal ordination from the primate of *Arles*, was inveſted by Pope GREGORY with power over all the Britiſh biſhops and Saxon prelates, and was the firſt archbiſhop of *Canterbury*.

[*f*] BEDE, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Gentis Anglor.* lib. i. cap. xxiii. p. 55. edit. Chifleti. RAPIN'S *Hiſtory of England*, *Acta Sanctor.* tom. iii. Februar. p. 470.

[*g*] BEDE, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 134.

[*b*] HENR. CANISII *Lection. Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part II. p. 208. AVENTINUS, *Annal. Boicrum*.

CENT. VI. PART I.

ceived the light of divine truth; though this fact appears extremely doubtful to many.

All these conversions and sacred exploits will lose much of their importance in the esteem of such, as examine with attention the accounts which have been given of them by the writers of this and the succeeding ages. For by these accounts it appears, that the converted nations, now mentioned, retained a great part of their former impiety, superstition, and licentiousness; and that, attached to CHRIST by a mere outward and nominal profession, they, in effect, renounced the purity of his doctrine, and the authority of his gospel, by their flagitious lives, and the superstitious and idolatrous rites and institutions which they continued to observe [*i*].

The Jews converted in several places.

III. A vast multitude of Jews, converted to Christianity in several places, were added to the church during the course of this century. Many in the east, particularly the inhabitants of *Borium*, a city of *Libya*, were brought over to the truth by the persuasion and influence of the emperor JUSTINIAN [*k*]. In the west, the zeal and authority of the Gallic and Spanish monarchs, the efforts of GREGORY the GREAT, and the labours of AVITUS bishop of *Vienne*, engaged numbers of that blinded nation to receive the gospel. It must, however, be acknowledged, that of these conversions the greatest part were owing to the liberality of Christian princes, or to the fear of punishment, rather than to the force of argument

[*i*] This is ingenuously confessed by the Benedictine monks, in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. Introduc. p. 8, 11. 13. See also the orders given to the Anglo-Saxons by GREGORY the GREAT, in his *Epist.* lib. xi. lxxvi. p. 1176. tom. ii. opp. edit. Benedict. where we find him permitting them to sacrifice to the saints, on their respective holidays, the victims which they had formerly offered to the gods. See also WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 18.

[*k*] PROCOPIUS, *De Ædificiis Justiniani*, lib. vi. cap. ii.

or to the love of truth. In *Gaul*, the Jews were compelled by CHILDERIC to receive the ordinance of baptiſm; and the ſame deſpotic method of converting was practiſed in *Spain* [*l*]. This method, however, was entirely diſapproved by GREGORY the GREAT, who, though extremely ſevere upon the heretics, would ſuffer no violence to be offered to the Jews [*m*].

The miracles of this century.

IV. If credit is to be given to the writers of this century, the converſion of theſe uncivilized nations to Chriſtianity was principally effected by the prodigies and miracles which the heralds of the goſpel were enabled to work in its behalf. But the conduct of the converted nations is ſufficient to invalidate the force of theſe teſtimonies: for certainly had ſuch miracles been wrought among them, their lives would have been more ſuitable to their profeſſion, and their attachment and obedience to the doctrines and laws of the goſpel more ſtedfaſt and exemplary than they appear to have been. Beſides, as we have already had occaſion to obſerve, in abandoning their ancient ſuperſtitions, the greateſt part of them were more influenced by the example and authority of their princes, than by force of argument, or the power of a rational conviction. And, indeed, if we conſider the wretched manner in which many of the firſt Chriſtian miſſionaries performed the ſolemn taſk they had undertaken, we ſhall perceive that they wanted not many arguments to enforce the doctrines they taught, and the diſcipline they recommended; for they required nothing of theſe barbarous people that was

[*l*] GREG. TURON. *Hiſtor. Francor.* lib. vi. cap. xvii. LAUNOIUS, *De veteri more baptizandi Judæos et infideles*, cap. i. p. 700. 704. tom. ii. part II. opp.

[*m*] See his *Epiſtles*, book i. *ep.* xlvii. tom. ii. opp. p. 541. edit. Benedict. particularly thoſe which he wrote to VIRGILIUS of *Arles*, THEODORUS of *Marſeilles*, and PETER of *Tarracina*.

CENT. VI. PART I.

difficult to be performed, or that laid any remarkable reſtraint upon their appetites and paſſions. The principal injunctions they impoſed upon theſe rude proſelytes were, that they ſhould get by heart certain ſummaries of doctrine, and pay to the images of CHRIST and the ſaints the ſame religious ſervices which they had formerly offered to the ſtatues of the gods. Nor were they at all delicate or ſcrupulous in chuſing the means of eſtabliſhing their credit; for they looked upon it as lawful, nay even meritorious, to deceive an ignorant and inattentive multitude, by repreſenting to them as prodigies, things that were merely natural, as we learn from the moſt authentic records of theſe times.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events which happened to the church during this century.

Some remains of Paganiſm are to be found in this century.

I. THOUGH the abjuration of Paganiſm was, by the imperial laws, made a neceſſary ſtep to preferment, and to the exerciſing all public offices; yet ſeveral perſons, reputed for their erudition and gravity of manners, perſiſted in their adherence to the antient ſuperſtition. TRIBONIAN, the famous compiler of the Roman law, is thought, by ſome, to have been among the number of thoſe who continued in their prejudices againſt the Chriſtian religion; and ſuch alſo, in the opinion of many, was the caſe of PROCOPIUS the celebrated hiſtorian. It is at leaſt undoubtedly certain, that AGATHIAS, who was an eminent lawyer at *Smyrna*, and who had alſo acquired a conſiderable reputation as an hiſtorical writer, perſevered in his attachment to the Pagan worſhip. Theſe illuſtrious Gentiles were

were exempted from the ſeverities which were employed frequently to engage the lower orders to abandon the ſervice of the gods. The rigour of the laws, as it uſually happens in human life, fell only upon thoſe who had neither rank, fortune, nor court-favour to ward off their execution.

II. Surpriſed as we may be at the protection granted to the perſons now mentioned, and that at a time when the goſpel was, in many inſtances, propagated by unchriſtian methods; it will appear ſtill more aſtoniſhing, that the Platonic philoſophers, whoſe oppoſition to Chriſtianity was univerſally known, ſhould be permitted, in *Greece* and *Egypt*, to teach publicly the tenets of their ſect, which were abſolutely incompatible with the doctrines of the goſpel. Theſe doctors indeed affected, generally ſpeaking, a high degree of moderation and prudence, and, for the moſt part, modified their expreſſions in ſuch a manner, as to give to the Pagan ſyſtem an evangelical aſpect, extremely adapted to deceive the unwary, as the examples of CHALCIDIUS [*n*] and ALEXANDER of *Lycopolis*

Several write againſt Chriſtianity.

☞ [*n*] The religion of CHALCIDIUS has been much diſputed among the learned. CAVE ſeems inclined to rank him among the Chriſtian writers, though he expreſſes ſome uncertainty about the matter. HUET, G. J. VOSSIUS, FABRICIUS, and BEAUSOBRE, decide with ſomewhat more aſſurance that CHALCIDIUS was a Chriſtian. Some learned men have maintained, on the contrary, that many things in the writings of this ſage entitle him to a place among the Pagan philoſophers. Our learned author, in his notes to his Latin tranſlation of CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem*, and in a *Diſſertation de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Eccleſia*, lays down an hypotheſis, which holds the middle way between theſe two extremes. He is of opinion that CHALCIDIUS neither rejected nor embraced the whole ſyſtem of the Chriſtian doctrine, but ſelected out of the religion of JESUS and the tenets of PLATO, a body of divinity, in which however Platoniſm was predominant; and that he was one of thoſe Syncretiſt or Eclectic philoſophers,

110766

Lycopolis abundantly teſtify [*o*]. Some of them however were leſs modeſt, nay, carried their audacious efforts againſt Chriſtianity ſo far as to revile it publicly. DAMASCIUS, in the life of ISODORUS, and in other places, caſts upon the Chriſtians the moſt ignominious aſperſions [*p*]; SIMPLICIUS, in his illuſtrations of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, throws out ſeveral malignant inſinu-

phers, who abounded in the fourth and fifth centuries, and who attempted the uniting Paganiſm and Chriſtianity into one motley ſyſtem. This account of the matter, however, appears too vague to the celebrated author of the *Critical Hiſtory of Philoſophy*, M. BRUCKER. This excellent writer agrees with Dr. MOSHEIM in this, that CHALCIDIUS followed the motley method of the eclectic Platoniſts, but does not ſee any thing in this inconſiſtent with his having publicly profeſſed the Chriſtian religion. For the queſtion is not, whether this philoſopher was a ſound and orthodox Chriſtian, which M. BRUCKER denies him to have been, but whether he had abandoned the Pagan rites, and made a public profeſſion of Chriſtianity; and this our philoſophical hiſtorian looks upon as evident. For though, in the commentary upon PLATO's *Timæus*, CHALCIDIUS teaches ſeveral doctrines that ſeem to ſtrike at the foundations of our holy religion, yet the ſame may be ſaid of ORIGEN, CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, ARNOBIUS, and others, who are, nevertheleſs, reckoned among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity. The reader will find a moſt excellent view of the different opinions concerning the religion of CHALCIDIUS, in the *Hiſt. Critica Philoſophiæ* BRUCKERI, tom. iii. p. 472—485. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this, that the Eclectics, before Chriſtianity became the religion of the ſtate, enriched their ſyſtem from the goſpel, but ranged themſelves under the ſtandards of PLATO; and that they repaired to thoſe of CHRIST, without any conſiderable change of their ſyſtem, when the examples and authority of the emperors rendered the profeſſion of the Chriſtian religion a matter of prudence, as well as its own excellence rendered it moſt juſtly a matter of choice.

☞ [*o*] ALEXANDER wrote a treatiſe againſt the Manichæans, which is publiſhed by COMBEFIS, in the ſecond tome of his *Auctor. Noviſſ. Biblioth. PP.* PHOTIUS, COMBEFIS, and our learned CAVE looked upon ALEXANDER as a proſelyte to Chriſtianity. But BEAUSOBRE has demonſtrated the contrary. See *Hiſtoire de Manicheiſme*, part II. *Diſcours Preliminaire*, § 13. p. 236.

[*p*] PHOTIUS, *Bibliothecæ Cod.* ccxlii. p. 1027.

ations

ations against the doctrines of the gospel; and the *Epicheiremata* of PROCLUS, written expressly against the disciples of JESUS, were universally read, and were, on that account, accurately refuted by PHILOPONUS [q]. All this shews, that many of the magistrates, who were witnesses of these calumnious attempts against the gospel, were not so much Christians in reality, as in appearance; otherwise they would not have permitted the slanders of these licentious revilers to pass without correction or restraint.

The sufferings of the Christians in several places.

III. Notwithstanding the extensive progress of the gospel, the Christians, even in this century, suffered grievously, in several places, from the savage cruelty and bitterness of their enemies. In *Britain*, the Anglo-Saxons, who were masters of that kingdom, involved a multitude of its antient inhabitants, who professed Christianity, in the deepest distresses, and tormented them with all that variety of suffering, which the injurious and malignant spirit of persecution could invent [r]. The Huns, in their irruption into *Thrace*, *Greece*, and the other provinces, during the reign of JUSTINIAN, treated the Christians with great barbarity; not so much, perhaps, from an aversion to Christianity, as from an hostile spirit of hatred against the Greeks, and a desire of overturning and destroying their empire. The face of affairs was totally changed in *Italy*, about the middle of this century, by a grand revolution which happened under the reign of JUSTINIAN I. This emperor, by the arms of NARSES, overturned the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, which had subsisted ninety years; and subdued all *Italy* under his dominion. The state of things, however, which this revolution introduced, was not of a very long

[q] See J. A. FABRICII *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iii. p. 522.

[r] USSERII *Index Chronol. Antiquit. Eccles. Britann. subjectus ad A.* DVIII. p. 1123.

CENT. VI. PART I.

duration; for the Lombards, a fierce and warlike people, headed by ALBOINUS their king, and joined by ſeveral other German nations, iſſued forth from *Pannonia*, in the year 568, under the reign of JUSTIN, invaded *Italy*; and, having made themſelves maſters of the whole country, except *Rome* and *Ravenna*, erected a new kingdom at *Ticinum*. Under theſe new tyrants, who, to the natural ferocity of their characters, added an averſion to the religion of JESUS, the Chriſtians, in the beginning, endured calamities of every kind. But the fury of theſe ſavage uſurpers gradually ſubſided; and their manners contracted, from time to time, a milder character. AUTHARIS, the third monarch of the Lombards, embraced Chriſtianity, as it was profeſſed by the Arians, in the year 587. But his ſucceſſor AGILULF, who married his widow THEUDELINDA, was perſuaded, by that princeſs, to abandon Arianiſm, and to adopt the tenets of the Nicene Catholics [*s*].

But the calamities of the Chriſtians, in all other countries, were light and inconſiderable in compariſon of thoſe which they ſuffered in *Perſia* under CHOSROES, the inhuman monarch of that nation. This monſter of impiety aimed his audacious and deſperate efforts againſt heaven itſelf; for he publicly declared, that he would make war not only upon JUSTINIAN, but alſo upon the God of the Chriſtians; and, in conſequence of this blaſphemous menace, he vented his rage againſt the followers of JESUS in the moſt barbarous manner, and put multitudes of them to the moſt cruel and ignominious deaths [*t*]

[*s*] PAUL. DIACON. *De geſtis Longobardorum*, lib. ii. cap. ii. xxvii. p. 219. 231. edit. Lindenbrogii. MURATORII *Antiq. Italiæ*, tom. i. p. 14. tom. ii. p. 297. GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 302.

[*t*] PROCOPIUS, *De bello Perſico*, lib. ii. cap. xxvi.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

THE incurſions of the barbarous nations into the greateſt part of the weſtern provinces, were extremely prejudicial to the intereſts of learning and philoſophy, as muſt be known to all who have any acquaintance with the hiſtory of theſe unhappy times. During theſe tumultuous ſcenes of deſolation and horror, the liberal arts and ſciences would have been totally extinguiſhed, had they not found a place of refuge, ſuch as it was, among the biſhops and the monaſtic orders. Here they aſſembled their ſcattered remains, and received a degree of culture which juſt ſerved to keep them from periſhing. Thoſe churches, which were diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Cathedrals*, had ſchools erected under their juriſdiction, in which the biſhop, or a certain perſon appointed by him, inſtructed the youth in the *ſeven liberal arts*, as a preparatory introduction to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures [*a*]. Perſons of both ſexes, who had devoted themſelves to the monaſtic life, were obliged, by the founders of their reſpective orders, to employ daily a certain portion of their time in reading the ancient doctors of the church,

The ſtate of letters in the weſt.

[*a*] FLEURY, *Diſcours ſur l'Hiſtoire Eccleſ. depuis l'an* 600, &c. § 21. p. 56. tom. xiii. *de l' Hiſtoire Eccleſ.*—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iii. Intr. § 32. p. 12. HERM. CONRINGII *Antiq. Academicæ*, p. 66—167. edit. Heummann, whoſe

CENT. VI. PART II.

whoſe writings were looked upon as the rich repertories of celeſtial wiſdom, in which all the treaſures of theology were centered [*b*]. Hence libraries were formed in all the monaſteries, and the pious and learned productions of the Chriſtian and other writers were copied and diſperſed by the diligence of tranſcribers appointed for that purpoſe, who were generally ſuch monks as, by weakneſs of conſtitution or other bodily infirmities, were rendered incapable of harder labour. To theſe eſtabliſhments we owe the preſervation and poſſeſſion of all the antient authors ſacred and profane, who eſcaped, in this manner, the ſavage fury of Gothic ignorance, and are happily tranſmitted to our times. It is alſo to be obſerved, that, beſides the ſchools that belonged to the cathedrals, there were others opened in the monaſteries, in which the youth who were ſet apart for the monaſtic life, were inſtructed by the abbot, or ſome of his eccleſiaſtics, in the arts and ſciences [*c*].

The ſciences are taught very imperfectly.

II. But theſe inſtitutions and eſtabliſhments, however laudable, did not produce ſuch happy effects as might have been expected from them. For not to ſpeak of the indolence of certain abbots and biſhops, who neglected entirely the duties of their ſtations, nor of the bitter averſion which others diſcovered towards every ſort of learning and erudition, which they conſidered as pernicious to the progreſs of piety [*d*]; not to ſpeak

[*b*] BENEDICT. ANIANENSIS *Concordia Regularum*; lib. ii. p. 55. 64. 75. 77. 80. 100. lib. iii. p. 16—41, &c. edit. Hug. Menardi. Jo. MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. 44.

[*c*] BENEDICT. *Concord. Reg.* lib. ii. p. 232. MABILLON, *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* tom. i. p. 314.

[*d*] GREGORY the GREAT is ſaid to have been of this number, and to have ordered a multitude of the productions of Pagan writers, and among others LIVY's *Roman Hiſtory*, to be committed

ſpeak of the *illiberal ignorance* which ſeveral prelates affected, and which they injudiciouſly confounded with *Chriſtian ſimplicity* [*e*]; even thoſe who applied themſelves to the ſtudy and propagation of the ſciences, were, for the moſt part, extremely unſkilful and illiterate; and the branches of learning taught in the ſchools, were inconſiderable both as to their quality and their number [*f*]. Greek literature was almoſt every where neglected; and thoſe who, by profeſſion, had devoted themſelves to the culture of Latin erudition, ſpent their time and labour in grammatical ſubtilties and quibbles, as the pedantic examples of ISIDORUS and CASSIODORUS abundantly ſhew. Eloquence was degraded into a rhetorical bombaſt, a noiſy kind of declamation, which was compoſed of motley and frigid allegories and barbarous terms, as may even appear from ſeveral parts of the writings of thoſe ſuperior geniuſes who ſurpaſſed their cotemporaries in preciſion and elegance, ſuch as BOETHIUS, CASSIODORUS, ENNODIUS, and others. As to the other liberal arts, they ſhared the common calamity; and, as they were now cultivated, had nothing very liberal or elegant in their appearance, conſiſting entirely in a few dry rules, which, inſtead of a complete and finiſhed ſyſtem, produced only a ghaſtly and lifeleſs ſkeleton.

The ſtudy of philoſophy decried.

III. Philoſophy fared ſtill worſe than literature: for it was entirely baniſhed from all the ſeminaries which were under the inſpection and government of the eccleſiaſtical order. The greateſt part of theſe zealots looked upon the ſtudy of philoſophy not only as uſeleſs, but even perni-

committed to the flames. See GABRIEL LIRON, *Singularités Hiſtor. et Litter.* tom. i. p. 166.

[*e*] MABILLON. *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedict.* p. 46.

[*f*] See M. AUR. CASSIODORI *Liber de ſeptem Diſciplinis*, which is extant among his works.

cious

CENT. VI. PART II.

cious to those who had dedicated themselves to the service of religion. The most eminent, nay almost the only Latin philosopher of this age, was the celebrated BOETHIUS, privy counsellor to THEODORIC, king of the Ostrogoths in *Italy*. This illustrious senator had embraced the Platonic philosophy [g], but approved also, as was usual among the modern Platonics, the doctrine of ARISTOTLE, and illustrated it in his writings. And it was undoubtedly owing to the diligence and zeal with which he explained and recommended the Aristotelian philosophy, that it arose now among the Latins to a higher degree of credit than it had hitherto enjoyed.

The state of letters among the Greeks.

IV. The state of the liberal arts among the Greeks was, in several places, much more flourishing than that in which we have left them among the Latins; and the emperors raised and nourished a spirit of literary emulation, by the noble rewards and the distinguished honours which they attached to the pursuit of all the various branches of learning [b]. It is, however, certain, that notwithstanding these encouragements, the sciences were cultivated with less ardour, and men of learning and genius were less numerous than in the preceding century.

In the beginning of this the modern Platonics maintained as yet their credit, and their philosophy was in vogue. The Alexandrian and Athenian schools flourished, under the direction of DAMASCIUS, ISIDORUS, SIMPLICIUS, EULAMIUS,

[g] This will appear evident to such as, with a competent knowledge of modern Platonism, read attentively the books of BOETIUS, *De consolatione*, &c. See also, on this subject, RENAT. VALL. p. 10. 50. HOLSTENIUS *en vita Porphyrii*, p. 7. edit. Cantabr. See also MASCOV. *Histor. Germanor.* tom. ii. p. 102.

[b] See the *Codex Theodos.* tom. ii. lib. vi. p. 113. HERM. CONRINGIUS, *De studiis urbis Romæ et Constantinop.* in a Dissertation subjoined to his *Antiquitates Academicæ*.

HERMIAS,

HERMIAS, PRISCIANUS, and others, who were placed on the higheſt ſummit of literary glory. But when the emperor JUSTINIAN, by a particular edict, prohibited the teaching philoſophy at *Athens* [*i*] (which edict, no doubt, was levelled at the modern Platoniſm already mentioned), and when his reſentment began to flame out againſt thoſe who refuſed to abandon the Pagan worſhip, then all theſe celebrated philoſophers took refuge among the Perſians, who were, at that time, the enemies of *Rome* [*k*]. They, indeed, returned from their voluntary exile, when the peace was concluded between the Perſians and the Romans A. D. 533 [*l*]; but they could never recover their former credit, and they gradually diſappeared in the public ſchools and ſeminaries of learning, which ceaſed, at length, to be under their direction.

Thus expired that famous ſect, which was diſtinguiſhed by the title of the Modern or Later Platonic; and which, for a ſeries of ages, had produced ſuch diviſions and tumults in the Chriſtian church, and been, in other reſpects, prejudicial to the intereſts and progreſs of the goſpel. It was ſucceeded by the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, which aroſe imperceptibly out of its obſcurity, and was placed in an advantageous light by the illuſtrations of the learned; but eſpecially and principally by the celebrated commentaries of PHILOPONUS. And, indeed, the knowledge of this philoſophy was neceſſary for the Greeks;

[*i*] JOHANNES MALELA, *Hiſtoria Chronica*, part II. p. 187. edit. Oxon. Another teſtimony concerning this matter is cited from a certain *Chronicle*, not yet publiſhed, by NIC. ALEMANNUS, *ad Procopii Hiſtor. Arcanam*, cap. xxvi. p. 377. edit. Venet.

[*k*] AGATHIAS, *De rebus Juſtiniani*, lib. ii. p. 49. edit. Venet. tom. ii. *Corpor. Byzant.*

[*l*] See WESSELINGII *Obſervat. Variar.* lib. i. cap. xviii. p. 117.

ſince

CENT. VI. PART II.

since it was from the depths of this peripatetical wisdom, that the Monophysites and Nestorians drew the subtilties with which they endeavoured to overwhelm the abettors of the Ephesian and Chalcedonian councils.

In the east.

V. The Nestorians and Monophysites, who lived in the east, turned equally their eyes towards ARISTOTLE, and, in order to train their respective followers to the field of controversy, and arm them with the subtilties of a contentious logic, translated the principal books of that deep philosopher into their native languages. SERGIUS, a Monophysite and philosopher, translated the books of ARISTOTLE into Syriac [*m*]. URANIUS, a Syrian, propagated the doctrines of this philosopher in *Persia*; and disposed in their favour CHOSROES, the monarch of that nation, who became a zealous abettor of the peripatetic system [*n*]. The same prince received from one of the Nestorian faction (which, after having procured the exclusion of the Greeks, triumphed at this time unrivalled in *Persia*) a translation of the Stagirite into the Persian language [*o*].

It is, however, to be observed, that among these eastern Christians there were some who rejected both the Platonic and Aristotelian doctrines; and, unwilling to be obliged to others for their philosophical knowledge, invented systems of their own, which were inexpressibly chimerical and pregnant with absurdities. Of this class of original philosophers was COSMAS, a Nes-

[*m*] GEORGIUS ABULPHARAIUS, *Historia Dynastiar.* published by Dr. POCOCK, p. 94. 172.

[*n*] See AGATHIAS, *De rebus Justiniani*, lib. ii. p. 48. That URANIUS made use of the Aristotelian philosophy in the Eutychian controversy, is evident even from this single circumstance, that AGATHIAS represents him disputing concerning the *passibility and immiscibility* of God (περὶ τοῦ παθητοῦ καὶ ἀξυγχύτου).

[*o*] AGATHIAS, l. c. lib. ii. p. 48. edit. Venet.

torian,

torian, commonly called Indicopleuſtes, whoſe doctrines are extremely ſingular, and reſemble more the notions of the Orientals than the opinions of the Greeks [p]. Such alſo was the writer, from whoſe *Expoſition of the Octateuch*, PHOTIUS has drawn ſeveral citations [q]. CENT. VI. PART II.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church.

1. THE external form of church government continued without any remarkable alteration during the courſe of this century. But the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, who were conſidered as the moſt eminent and principal rulers of the Chriſtian church, were engaged in perpetual diſputes about the extent and limits of their reſpective juriſdictions, and ſeemed both to aſpire at the ſupreme authority in eccleſiaſtical matters. The biſhop of *Conſtantinople* not only claimed an unrivalled ſovereignty over the eaſtern churches, but alſo maintained, that his church was, in point of dignity, no way inferior to that of *Rome*. The Roman pontifs beheld, with impatience, theſe lordly pretenſions, and warmly aſſerted the pre-eminence of their church, and its undoubted ſuperiority over that of *Conſtantinople*. GREGORY the GREAT diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this violent conteſt; and the following event furniſhed him with an opportunity of exerting his zeal. In the year 588, JOHN biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, ſurnamed the FASTER, on account of his extraordinary abſtinence and auſterity, aſſembled, by his own au- Diſputes between the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*.

[p] BERNARD DE MONTFAUCON, *Præfat. ad Coſman*, p. 10. tom. ii. *Collectionis novæ patrum Græcorum*.

[q] *Biblioth. Codic.* XXXVI. p. 22, 23.

thority,

thority, a council at *Conſtantinople*, to inquire into an accuſation brought againſt PETER patriarch of *Antioch*; and, upon this occaſion, aſſumed the title of *œcumenical*, or *univerſal biſhop* [r]. Now, although this title had been formerly enjoyed by the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, and was alſo ſuſceptible of an interpretation that might have prevented its giving umbrage or offence to any [s], yet GREGORY ſuſpected, both from the time and the occaſion of JOHN's renewing his claim to it, that he was aiming at a ſupremacy over all the Chriſtian churches; and therefore he oppoſed his claim in the moſt vigorous manner, in letters to that purpoſe addreſſed to the emperor, and to ſuch perſons as he judged proper to ſecond his oppoſition. But all his efforts were without effect; and the biſhops of *Conſtantinople* continued to aſſume the title in queſtion, though not in the ſenſe in which it had alarmed the Roman pontif [t].

☞ [r] We cannot avoid taking notice of ſome miſtakes which have ſlipped from the pen of Dr. MOSHEIM in his narration of this event. *Firſt*, the council here mentioned was held under the pontificate of PELAGIUS II. and not of GREGORY the GREAT, who was not choſen biſhop of *Rome* before A.D. 590. *Secondly*, The perſon accuſed before this council was not PETER, but GREGORY biſhop of *Antioch*. *Thirdly*, It does not appear that the council was ſummoned by JOHN of *Conſtantinople*, but by the emperor MAURICIUS, to whom GREGORY had appealed from the governor of the eaſt, before whom he was firſt accuſed.

☞ [s] The title of *univerſal biſhop*, which had been given by LEO and JUSTINIAN to the patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, was not attended with any acceſſion of power.

[t] GREGOR. MAGNI *Epiſt.* lib. iv. v. vii. All the paſſages in theſe epiſtles that relate to this famous conteſt, have been extracted and illuſtrated by LAUNOIUS, in his *Aſſertio in Privileg. S. Medardi*, tom. iii. opp. part II. p. 266. See alſo LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 67. PFAFFII *Diſſertatio de titulo Oecumenicus*, in the *Tempe Helvetica*, tom. iv. p. 99.

The Roman pontif ſtruggles hard for univerſal dominion.

II. This pontif, however, adhered tenaciouſly to his purpoſe, oppoſed with vehemence the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, raiſed new tumults and diſſenſions among the ſacred order, and aimed at no leſs than an unlimited ſupremacy over the Chriſtian church. This ambitious deſign ſucceeded in the weſt; while, in the eaſtern provinces, his arrogant pretenſions were ſcarcely reſpected by any but thoſe who were at enmity with the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; and this prelate was always in a condition to make head againſt the progreſs of his authority in the eaſt. How much the opinions of ſome were favourable to the lordly demands of the Roman pontifs, may be eaſily imagined from an expreſſion of ENNODIUS, that infamous and extravagant flatterer of SYMMACHUS, who was a prelate of but ambiguous fame. This paraſitical panegyriſt, among other impertinent aſſertions, maintained, that the Roman pontif was conſtituted *judge in the place of God*, which he filled as the vicegerent of the Moſt High [*u*]. On the other hand, it is certain, from a variety of the moſt authentic records, that both the emperors and the nations in general were far from being diſpoſed to bear with patience the yoke of ſervitude, which the ſee of *Rome* was arrogantly impoſing upon the Chriſtian church [*w*]. The Gothic princes ſet bounds to the power of the biſhop of *Rome* in *Italy*, permitted none to be raiſed to

[*u*] See his *Apologeticum pro Synodo*, in the xvth volume of the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*, p. 248. edit. Paris. ☞ One would think that this ſervile adulator had never read the 4th verſe of the iid chapter of *St.* PAUL's 2d *Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians*, where the *Anti-Chriſt*, or *man of ſin*, is deſcribed in the very terms in which he repreſents the authority of the pontif SYMMACHUS.

[*w*] See particularly the truth of this aſſertion, with reſpect to *Spain*, in GEDDES's *Diſſertation on the Papal Supremacy, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spaniſh church*, which is to be found in the ſecond volume of his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*.

CENT. VI. PART II.

the pontificate without their approbation, and reſerved to themſelves the right of judging concerning the legality of every new election [x]. They enacted ſpiritual laws, called the religious orders before their tribunals, and ſummoned councils by their regal authority [y]. In conſequence of all this, the pontifs, amidſt all their high pretenſions, reverenced the majeſty of their kings and emperors, and ſubmitted to their authority with the moſt profound humility; nor were they, as yet, ſo loſt to all ſenſe of ſhame, as to aim at the ſubjection of kings and princes to their ghoſtly dominion [z].

Vices and corruption of the clergy.

III. The rights and privileges of the clergy were very conſiderable before this period, and the riches, which they had accumulated, immenſe: and both received daily augmentations from the growth of ſuperſtition in this century. The arts of a rapacious prieſthood were practiſed upon the ignorant devotion of the ſimple; and even the remorſe of the wicked was made an inſtrument of increaſing the eccleſiaſtical treaſure. For an opinion was propagated with induſtry among the people, that the remiſſion of their ſins was to be purchaſed by their liberalities to the churches and monks, and that the prayers of departed ſaints, whoſe efficacy was victorious at the throne of God, were to be bought by offerings preſented to the temples, which were conſecrated to theſe celeſtial mediators. But, in proportion as the riches of the church increaſed, the various orders

[x] See Jo. JAC. MASCOVII *Hiſtor. Germanor.* tom. ii. not. p. 113.

[y] BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformés*, tom. i. p. 381.

[z] See the citations from GREGORY the GREAT, collected by LAUNOIS, *De regia poteſtate in matrimon.* tom. i. opp. part II. p. 691. and in his *Aſſertio in Privilegium S. Medardi*, p. 272. tom. iii. opp. part II. See alſo GIANNONE, *Hiſt. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 282.

of

of the clergy were infected with those vices that are too often the consequences of an affluent prosperity. This appears, with the utmost evidence, from the imperial edicts and the decrees of councils, which were so frequently levelled at the immoralities of those who were distinguished by the name of *clerks*. For whence so many laws to restrain the vices, and to preserve the morals of the ecclesiastical orders, if they had fulfilled even the obligations of external decency, or shewn, in the general tenor of their lives, a certain degree of respect for religion and virtue? Be that as it will, the effect of all these laws and edicts was so inconsiderable as to be scarcely perceived; for so high was the veneration paid, at this time, to the clergy, that their most flagitious crimes were corrected by the slightest and gentlest punishments: an unhappy circumstance, which added to their presumption, and rendered them more daring and audacious in iniquity.

The bishops of *Rome* not excepted.

IV. The bishops of *Rome*, who considered themselves as the chiefs and fathers of the Christian church, are not to be excepted from this censure, any more than the clergy who were under their jurisdiction. We may form some notion of their humility and virtue by that long and vehement contention, which arose in the year 498, between SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS, who were, on the same day, elected to the pontificate by different parties, and whose dispute was, at length, decided by THEODORIC king of the Goths. Each of these ecclesiastics maintained obstinately the validity of his election; they reciprocally accused each other of the most detestable crimes; and to their mutual dishonour, their accusations did not appear, on either side, entirely destitute of foundation. Three different councils, assembled at *Rome*, endeavoured to terminate this

odious ſchiſm [*a*], but without ſucceſs. A fourth was ſummoned, by THEODORIC, to examine the accuſations brought againſt SYMMACHUS, to whom this prince had, at the beginning of the ſchiſm, adjudged the papal chair. This council was held about the commencement of this century, and in it the Roman pontif was acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. But the adverſe party refuſed to acquieſce in this deciſion; and this gave occaſion to ENNODIUS of *Ticinum*, now *Pavia*, to draw up his adulatory *apology for the council and* SYMMACHUS [*b*]. In this apology, which diſguiſes the truth under the ſeducing colours of a gaudy rhetoric, the reader will perceive that the foundations of that enormous power, which the popes of *Rome* afterwards acquired, were now laid; but he will ſeek in vain in this laboured production any ſatisfactory proof of the injuſtice of the charge brought againſt SYMMACHUS [*c*].

The growth of the monks.

V. The number, credit, and influence of the monks augmented daily in all parts of the Chriſtian world. They multiplied ſo prodigiouſly in the eaſt, that whole armies might have been raiſed out of the monaſtic order, without any ſenſible

☞ [*a*] This ſchiſm may be truly termed odious, as it was carried on by aſſaſſinations, maſſacres, and all the cruel proceedings of a deſperate civil war. See PAUL DIACONUS, lib. xvii.

[*b*] This *apology* may be ſeen in the xvth volume of the *Magn. Bibl. Patrum*, p. 248.

☞ [*c*] That SYMMACHUS was never fairly acquitted, may be preſumed from the *firſt*, and proved from the *ſecond* of the following circumſtances: *Firſt*, That THEODORIC, who was a wiſe and equitable prince, and who had attentively examined the charge brought againſt him, would not have referred the deciſion to the biſhops, if the matter had been clear, but would have pronounced judgment himſelf, as he had formerly done concerning the legality of his election. The *ſecond* circumſtance againſt SYMMACHUS is, that the council acquitted him without ſo much as hearing thoſe who accuſed him: and he himſelf did not appear, though frequently ſummoned.

diminution

diminution of that enormous body. The monaſtic life was alſo highly honoured, and had an incredible number of patrons and followers in all the weſtern provinces, as appears from the rules which were preſcribed, in this century, by various doctors, for directing the conduct of the cloiſtered monks and the Holy Virgins that had ſacrificed their capacity of being uſeful in the world, to the gloomy charms of a convent [*d*]. In *Great Britain*, a certain abbot, named CONGALL, is ſaid to have perſuaded an incredible number of perſons to abandon the affairs, obligations, and duties of ſocial life, and to ſpend the remainder of their days in ſolitude, under a rule of diſcipline, of which he was the inventor [*e*]. His diſciples travelled through many countries, in which they propagated, with ſuch ſucceſs, the contagion of this monaſtic devotion, that, in ſome time, *Ireland*, *Gaul*, *Germany*, and *Switzerland*, ſwarmed with thoſe lazy orders, and were, in a manner, covered with convents. The moſt illuſtrious diſciple of the abbot now mentioned, was COLUMBAN, whoſe ſingular rule of diſcipline is yet extant, and ſurpaſſes all the reſt in ſimplicity and brevity [*f*]. The monaſtic orders, in general, abounded with fanatics and profligates; the *latter* were more numerous than the *former* in the weſtern convents, while, in thoſe of the eaſt, the fanatics were predominant.

VI. A new order of monks, which in a manner abſorbed all the others that were eſtabliſhed in the

The riſe of the Benedictine order.

[*d*] Theſe are in HOLSTENIUS's *Codex Regularum*, part II. which work was publiſhed at *Rome* in three volumes 4to, in the year 1661. See alſo EDM. MARTENE et URSIN. DURAND. *Theſaur. Anecdot. Nov.* tom. i. p. 4.

[*e*] JAC. USSERII *Antiq. Eccleſ. Britan.*

[*f*] USSERII *Sylloge Antiquar. Epiſtolar. Hibernicar.* p. 5—15. HOLSTENII *Codex Regularum*, tom. ii. p. 48. MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæculum* ii. *Benedictinum*, p. 4.

CENT. VI. PART II.

weſt, was inſtituted, A. D. 529, by BENEDICT of *Nurſia*, a man of piety and reputation for the age he lived in. From his *rule* of diſcipline, which is yet extant, we learn that it was not his intention, to impoſe it upon all the monaſtic ſocieties, but to form an order whoſe diſcipline ſhould be milder, their eſtabliſhment more ſolid, and their manners more regular, than thoſe of the other monaſtic bodies; and whoſe members, during the courſe of a holy and peaceful life, were to divide their time between prayer, reading, the education of youth, and other pious and learned labours [g]. But, in proceſs of time, the followers of this celebrated eccleſiaſtic degenerated ſadly from the piety of their founder, and loſt ſight of the duties of their ſtation and the great end of their eſtabliſhment. Having acquired immenſe riches from the devout liberality of the opulent, they ſunk into luxury, intemperance, and ſloth, abandoned themſelves to all ſorts of vices, extended their zeal and attention to worldly affairs, inſinuated themſelves into the cabinets of princes, took part in political cabals and court factions, made a vaſt augmentation of ſuperſtitious rites and ceremonies in their order, to blind the multitude, and ſupply the place of their expiring virtue; and, among other *meritorious* enterpriſes, laboured moſt ardently to ſwell the arrogance, by enlarging the power and authority of the Roman pontif. The good BENEDICT never dreamt that the great purpoſes of his inſtitution were to be thus perverted, much leſs did he give any encouragement or permiſſion to ſuch flagrant abuſes. His rule of diſcipline was neither favourable to luxury nor ambition; and it is ſtill

[g] See MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* i. and *Annales Ordin. Benedict.* tom. i. See alſo HELYOTUS and the other writers, who have given accounts of the monaſtic orders.

celebrated

celebrated on account of its excellence, though it has not been obſerved for many ages.

It is proper to remark here, that the inſtitution of BENEDICT changed, in ſeveral reſpects, the obligations and duties of the monaſtic life as it was regulated in the weſt. Among other things, he obliged thoſe who entered into his order to promiſe, at the time of their being received as Novitiates, and afterwards, at their *admiſſion* as members of the ſociety, to perſevere in an obedience to the rules he had laid down, without attempting to change them in any reſpect. As he was extremely ſolicitous about the ſtability of his inſtitution, this particular regulation was wiſe and prudent; and it was ſo much the more neceſſary, that, before his time, the monks made no ſcruple of altering the laws and rules of their founders as often as they thought proper [*h*].

VII. This new order made a moſt rapid progreſs in the weſt, and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, arrived at the moſt flouriſhing ſtate. In *Gaul*, its intereſts were promoted by MAURUS; in *Sicily* and *Sardinia*, by PLACIDUS; in *England*, by AUGUSTIN and MELLITUS; in *Italy*, and other countries, by GREGORY the GREAT, who is himſelf reported to have been for ſome time a member of this ſociety [*i*]; and it was afterwards received in *Germany* by the means of BONIFACE [*k*]. This

Its rapid progreſs.

[*h*] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part I. p. 18.

[*i*] See MABILLON, *Diſſ. de vita Monaſtica Gregorii M. ad Hadr. Valeſium*, tom. ii. *Analect. veter.* as alſo his *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedict.* p. 29. This circumſtance however is denied by ſome writers; and among others, by GALLONIUS, concerning whoſe book, upon that ſubject, ſee SIMON's *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iii. p. 63.

[*k*] ANTON. DADINI ALTESERRÆ, *Origines rei Monaſticæ*, lib. i. cap. ix, p. 33. The propagation of the Benedictine order, through the different provinces of Europe, is related by MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedictinum*, et *ad Sæc.* iv. part I. p. 62.

ſudden and amazing progreſs of the new order was aſcribed by the Benedictines, to the wiſdom and ſanctity of their diſcipline, and to the miracles which were worked by their founder and his followers. But a more attentive view of things will convince the impartial obſerver, that the protection of the Roman pontifs, to the advancement of whoſe grandeur and authority the Benedictines were moſt ſervilely devoted, contributed much more to the luſtre and influence of their order, than any other circumſtances, nay, than all other conſiderations united together. But, however univerſal their credit was, they did not reign alone; other orders ſubſiſted in ſeveral places until the ninth century, when the Benedictin abſorbed, indeed, all the other religious ſocieties, and held, unrivalled, the reins of the monaſtic empire [*l*].

The principal Greek and Oriental writers.

VIII. The moſt celebrated Greek and Oriental writers that flouriſhed in this century, were thoſe which follow:

PROCOPIUS of *Gaza*, who interpreted ſucceſſfully ſeveral books of ſcripture [*m*].

MAXENTIUS, a monk of *Antioch*, who, beſides ſeveral treatiſes againſt the ſects of his time, compoſed *Scholiums on* DIONYSIUS *the Areopagite.*

AGAPETUS, whoſe *Stheda Regia*, addreſſed to the emperor JUSTINIAN, procured him a place among the wiſeſt and moſt judicious writers of this century.

EULOGIUS, a preſbyter of *Antioch*, who was the terror of heretics, and a warm and ſtrenuous defender of the orthodox faith.

[*l*] LENFANT, *Hiſtoire du Concile de Conſtance*, tom. ii. p. 32, 33.

[*m*] See SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 197.

JOHN,

JOHN, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who, on account of his auſtere method of life, was ſurnamed the FASTER, and who acquired a certain degree of reputation by ſeveral little productions, and more particularly by his *Penitential.*

LEONTIUS of *Byzantium*, whoſe book againſt the ſects, and other writings, are yet extant.

EVAGRIUS, a ſcholaſtic writer, whoſe *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* is, in many places, corrupted with fabulous narrations.

ANASTATIUS of *Sinai*, whom moſt writers conſider as the author of a trifling performance, written againſt a ſort of heretics called Acephali, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak afterwards [*n*].

IX. Among the Latin writers the following are principally worthy of mention: Latin writers.

GREGORY the GREAT, biſhop of *Rome*, who united the moſt inconſiſtent and contradictory qualities; as in ſome caſes he diſcovered a ſound and penetrating judgment, and in others the moſt ſhameful and ſuperſtitious weakneſs; and in general manifeſted an extreme averſion to all kinds of learning, as his *Epiſtles* and *Dialogues* ſufficiently teſtify [*o*].

CÆSARIUS of *Arles*, who compoſed ſome moral writings, and drew up a *rule* of conduct and diſcipline for the *Holy Virgins* [*p*].

FULGENTIUS biſhop of *Ruſpina*, who attacked, with great warmth, the Arians and Pelagians in *Africa*; but whoſe ſtyle and manner were harſh

[*n*] See, for an account of this book, SIMON, l. c. tom. i. p. 232; as alſo BARAT. *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, tom. ii. p. 21.

[*o*] A ſplendid edition of the works of GREGORY was publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1705, in four volumes folio, by father St. MARTHE, a Benedictin monk. See an account of this pontif, *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. Martii, p. 121.

[*p*] Of this writer, the Benedictin monks have given a learned account in their *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iii. p. 190.

and

and uncouth, as was generally the caſe of the African writers [q].

ENNODIUS biſhop of *Ticinum*, now *Pavia*, who was none of the meaneſt authors of this century, whether we conſider his compoſitions in proſe or in verſe; though he diſgraced his talents, and diſhonoured his eloquence, by his infamous adulation of the Roman pontif, whom he exalted ſo high above all mortals, as to maintain that he was anſwerable to none upon earth for his conduct, and ſubject to no human tribunal [r].

BENEDICT of *Nurſia*, who acquired an immortal name, by the *rule* he laid down for the order which he inſtituted, and the multitude of religious ſocieties that ſubmitted to his diſcipline.

DIONYSIUS, who was ſurnamed the LITTLE, on account of his extraordinary humility, and was deſervedly eſteemed for his *Collection of the ancient canons*, and alſo for his *Chronological Reſearches*.

FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS, an African, who acquired a conſiderable degree of reputation by ſeveral treatiſes, but eſpecially by his *Abridgment of the Canons*; though his ſtyle and diction were entirely deſtitute of harmony and elegance.

FACUNDUS, a ſtrenuous defender of the *Three Chapters*, of which we ſhall give an account in their place.

ARATOR, who tranſlated, with tolerable ſucceſs, *The Acts of the Apoſtles*, into Latin verſe.

PRIMASIUS of *Adrumetum*, whoſe *Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, as alſo his book *Concerning hereſies*, are yet extant.

LIBERATUS, whoſe *Compendious Hiſtory of the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies*, intitle him to

[q] See, for an account of FULGENTIUS, the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Januar. p. 32, &c.

[r] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 96.

an eminent rank among the writers of this century. CENT. VI. PART II.

FORTUNATUS, a man of various erudition, and whose poetic compositions are far from being destitute of genius [*s*].

GREGORY of *Tours*, who is esteemed the father of Gallic history; and who would have descended with honour to posterity, did not his *Annals of the Francs*, and the rest of his writings, carry so many marks of levity, credulity, and weakness [*t*].

GILDAS, the most ancient of the British writers, who composed a book *Concerning the destruction of Britain*, in which there are several things not altogether unworthy of the curiosity of the learned.

COLUMBANUS, a native of *Ireland*, who became famous on account of the monastic rules he prescribed to his followers, his zeal for establishing religious orders, and his poetical productions [*u*].

ISIDORE bishop of *Seville*, whose grammatical, theological, and historical productions discover more learning and pedantry, than judgment and taste.

We may conclude this enumeration of the Latin writers with the illustrious names of BOETHIUS and CASSIODORUS, who far surpassed all their cotemporaries in learning and knowledge; the former shone forth with the brightest lustre in the republic of letters, as a philosopher, an ora-

[*s*] *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 464.

[*t*] The life of GREGORY of *Tours* is to be found in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*; and his faults are mentioned by PAGI, in his *Dissert. de Dionysio Paris.* § 25. n. 6. which is added to the fourth tome of the *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* LAUNOIUS defends this historian in many things in his works, tom i. part II. p. 131.

[*u*] None have given more accurate accounts of GILDAS and COLUMBAN than the learned Benedictins, *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 279. 505.

tor,

tor, a poet, and a divine, and both in elegance and ſubtilty of genius had no ſuperior, nor indeed any equal in this century; the latter, though in many reſpects inferior to him, was nevertheleſs far from being deſtitute of merit [w]. Several productions of theſe writers have been tranſmitted down to our times.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church during this century.

The increaſe of ſuperſtition.

I. WHEN once the miniſters of the church had departed from the ancient ſimplicity of religious worſhip, and ſullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to ſet bounds to this growing corruption. Abuſes were daily multiplied, and ſuperſtition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of abſurdities, which were added to the doctrine of CHRIST and his apoſtles. The controverſial writers in the eaſtern provinces continued to render perplexed and obſcure ſome of the principal doctrines of Chriſtianity, by the ſubtile diſtinctions which they borrowed from a vain and chimerical philoſophy. The public teachers and inſtructors of the people degenerated ſadly from the apoſtolic character. They ſeemed to aim at nothing elſe, than to ſink the multitude into the moſt opprobrious ignorance and ſuperſtition, to efface in their minds all ſenſe of the beauty and excellence of genuine piety, and to ſubſtitute, in the place of religious principles, a blind veneration for the clergy, and

[w] See SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque de M.* DU PIN, tom. I. p. 211.

a ſtu-

a ſtupid zeal for a ſenſeleſs round of ridiculous rites and ceremonies. This, perhaps, will appear leſs ſurprizing, when we conſider, that *the blind led the blind*; for the public miniſters and teachers of religion were, for the moſt part, groſsly ignorant; nay, almoſt as much ſo as the multitude whom they were appointed to inſtruct.

Proved by examples.

II. To be convinced of the truth of the diſmal repreſentation we have here given of the ſtate of religion at this time, nothing more is neceſſary than to caſt an eye upon the doctrines now taught *concerning the worſhip of images and ſaints, the fire of purgatory, the efficacy of good works*, i. e. the obſervance of human rites and inſtitutions, *towards the attainment of ſalvation, the power of relics to heal the diſeaſes of body and mind*; and ſuch like ſordid and miſerable fancies, which are inculcated in many of the ſuperſtitious productions of this century, and particularly in the epiſtles and other writings of GREGORY the GREAT. Nothing more ridiculous on the one hand, than the ſolemnity and liberality with which this good, but ſilly, pontif diſtributed the wonder-working relics; and nothing more lamentable on the other, than the ſtupid eagerneſs and devotion with which the deluded multitude received them, and ſuffered themſelves to be perſuaded, that a portion of ſtinking oil, taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a ſupernatural efficacy to ſanctify its poſſeſſors, and to defend them from all dangers both of a temporal and ſpiritual nature [x].

The ſtate of exegetical or explanatory theology.

III. Several attempts were made in this century to lay down a proper and judicious method of explaining the ſcriptures. Of this nature were the two books of JUNILIUS the African,

[x] See the *Liſt of ſacred oils, which* GREGORY *the* GREAT *ſent queen* THEUDELINDA, in the work of RUINARTUS, intituled, *Acta Martyrum ſincera et ſelecta*, p. 619.

Concerning

CENT. VI. PART II.

Concerning the various parts of the divine law [y]; a work deſtitute of preciſion and method, and by which it appears that the author had not ſufficient knowledge and penetration for the taſk he undertook.

CASSIODORUS alſo, in his two books *Concerning the divine laws*, has delivered ſeveral rules for the right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

PHILOXENUS the Syrian tranſlated, into his native language, the *Pſalms of David*, and the *Books of the New Teſtament* [z].

The number of interpreters was conſiderable in this century. Thoſe, who made the greateſt figure among the Greeks in this character, were PROCOPIUS of *Gaza*, SEVERUS of *Antioch*, JULIAN, and a few others; the firſt was an expoſitor of no mean abilities [a]. The moſt eminent rank among the Latin commentators is due to GREGORY the GREAT, CASSIODORUS, PRIMASIUS [b], ISIDORE of *Seville* [c], and BELLATOR.

The defects of theſe expoſitors.

IV. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that theſe writers ſcarcely deſerve the name of expoſitors, if we except a ſmall number of them, and among theſe the eaſtern NESTORIANS, who, following the example of THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, were careful in exploring the true ſenſe, and the native energy of the words employed in the Holy Scriptures. So that we may divide the commentators of this age into two claſſes. In the *firſt*,

[y] See SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 229.

[z] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNUS, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom ii. p. 83.

[a] See SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iv. p. 120. of the new edition.

[b] SIMON, *Hiſt. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* chap. xxiv. p. 307: as alſo his *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccl. de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 226.

[c] SIMON, *Critique de la*, &c. *du M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 259.

we

we rank those who did nothing more than collect the opinions and interpretations which had been received by the ancient doctors of the church; which collections were afterwards called *chains* by the Latins [*d*]. Such was the *chain of* OLYMPIODORUS *on* JOB; the *chain of* VICTOR *of* Capua *upon the Four Gospels*; and the *commentary of* PRIMASIUS *on the Epistle to the Romans*, which was compiled from the works of AUGUSTIN, JEROME, AMBROSE, and others. Even PROCOPIUS of *Gaza* may be ranked in this class, though not with so much reason as the mere compilers now mentioned; since, in many cases, he has consulted the dictates of his own judgment, and not followed, with a servile and implicit submission, the voice of antiquity. To the *second* class belong those fanciful expositors, who, setting up ORIGEN as their great model, neglect and overlook entirely the sense of the words employed by the sacred writers, lose themselves in spiritual refinements and allegorical digressions, and, by the succour of a lively and luxuriant imagination, draw from the scriptures arguments in favour of every whim they have thought proper to adopt. Such was ANASTATIUS the Sinaite, whose *Mysterious contemplations upon the six days creation* [*e*], betray the levity and ignorance of their author; and GREGORY the GREAT, whose *Moral observations upon the book of* JOB, have formerly met with unmerited commendations. Such also were ISIDORE of *Seville*, and PRIMASIUS, as manifestly appears by the *Book of Allegories upon the Holy Scriptures* [*f*], which was invented by the former, and

[*d*] See STEPH. LE MOYNE, *Prolegomena ad varia Sacra*, p. 53. Jo. ALBERT. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græcæ*, lib. v. cap. xvii. or vol. vii. p. 727.

[*e*] The title is *Contemplationes Anagogicæ in Hexaëmeron.*

[*f*] *Liber Allegoriarum in Scripturam Sacram.*

the

CENT. VI. PART II.

the *Myſtical expoſition of the book of the Revelation* [g], which was imagined by the latter.

The methods of explaining the Chriſtian doctrine which now prevailed.

V. It would be needleſs to expect, from the divines of this century, an accurate view, or a clear and natural explanation, of the Chriſtian doctrine. The greateſt part of them reaſoned and diſputed concerning the truths of the goſpel, as the blind would argue about light and colours; and imagined that they had acquitted themſelves nobly, when they had thrown out a heap of crude and indigeſted notions, and overwhelmed their adverſaries with a torrent of words.

We may perceive, however, in the writers of this age, ſome evident marks of the three different methods of explaining and inculcating the doctrines of religion, which are yet practiſed among the Greeks and Latins. For ſome collected together a heap, rather than a ſyſtem of theological opinions, from the writings of the ancient doctors, from the decrees of councils, and from the Holy Scriptures; ſuch were ISIDORE of *Seville* among the Latins; whoſe *three books of ſentences*, or *opinions*, are ſtill extant; and LEONTIUS the Cyprian among the Greeks, whoſe *Loci communes*, or *Common-place book of divinity*, which he had compiled from the writings of the ancients, have been much eſteemed. Theſe Authors gave riſe to that ſpecies of divinity, which the Latins diſtinguiſhed afterwards by the name of *poſitive theology*.

Others endeavoured to explain the various doctrines of Chriſtianity by reaſoning upon their nature, their excellence, and fitneſs; and thus it was, even with the weapons of *reaſon* and *argument*, that the moſt of the Chriſtian doctors diſputed againſt the Neſtorians, the Eutychians, and the Pelagians. Theſe metaphyſical divines

[g] *Expoſitio Myſtica in Apocalypſin.*

were called *ſchoolmen*, and their writings were afterwards characteriſed under the general term of *ſcholaſtic divinity*.

A third claſs of theological teachers, very different from thoſe already mentioned, comprehended a certain ſpecies of fanatics, who maintained that the knowledge of divine truth was only to be derived from inward feeling and mental contemplation. This claſs aſſumed the appellation of myſtics. Theſe three methods of deducing and unfolding the doctrines of the goſpel have been tranſmitted down to our times. No writer of this century compoſed a judicious or complete ſyſtem of divinity; though ſeveral branches of that ſacred ſcience were occaſionally illuſtrated.

The ſtate of practical religion and virtue.

VI. Thoſe who conſecrated their pious labours to the advancement of practical religion and moral virtue, aimed at the fulfilling this good purpoſe, partly by laying down *precepts*, and partly by exhibiting edifying *examples*. They who promoted the cauſe of piety and virtue in the former way, modified their *precepts* according to the ſtate and circumſtances of the perſons for whom they were deſigned. One ſort of precepts were addreſſed to thoſe who had not abandoned the connections of civil ſociety, but lived amidſt the hurry of worldly affairs. A different ſet of rules was adminiſtered to thoſe who aſpired after higher degrees of perfection, and lived in a retirement from the contagion and vanities of the world. The *precepts*, addreſſed to the former, repreſent the Chriſtian life, as conſiſting in certain external virtues, and acts of religion; as appears from the *Homilies* and *Exhortations* of CÆSARIUS; the *Capita Parænetica* of AGAPETUS; and eſpecially from the *Formula honeſtæ vitæ*, i. e. the *Summary of a virtuous life*, drawn up by MARTIN, archbiſhop

ſhop of *Braga* [*b*]. The rules adminiſtered to the latter ſort of Chriſtians, were more ſpiritual and ſublime: they were exhorted to ſeparate, as far as was poſſible, the ſoul from the body by divine contemplation; and for that purpoſe, to enervate and emaciate the latter by watching, faſting, perpetual prayer, and ſinging of pſalms; as we find in the diſſertation of FULGENTIUS, *upon faſting*, and thoſe of NICETIUS, *Concerning the vigils of the ſervants of God*, and *the good effects of pſalmody*. The Greeks adopted for their leader, in this myſtic labyrinth, DIONYSIUS, falſely called the Areopagite, whoſe pretended writings JOHN of *Scythopolis* illuſtrated with annotations in this century. We need not be at any pains in pointing out the defects of theſe injudicious zealots; the ſmalleſt acquaintance with that rational religion, which is contained in the goſpel, will be ſufficient to open the eyes of the impartial upon the abſurdities of that chimerical devotion we have now been deſcribing.

The lives of the ſaints.

VII. They who enforced the duties of Chriſtianity, by exhibiting *examples* of piety and virtue to the view of thoſe, for whom their inſtructions were deſigned, wrote, for this purpoſe, the *Lives of the ſaints*; and there was a conſiderable number of this kind of biographers both among the Greeks and Latins. ENNODIUS, EUGIPPIUS, CYRIL of *Scythopolis*, DIONYSIUS the Little, COGITOSUS, and others, are to be ranked in this claſs. But, however pious the intentions of theſe biographers may have been, it muſt be acknowledged, that they executed it in a moſt contemptible manner. No models of rational piety are to be found among thoſe pretended worthies, whom they propoſe to Chriſtians as objects of imitation. They amuſe their readers with gigan-

[*b*] See the *Acta Sanctor. Martii*, tom. iii. p. 86.

tic

tic fables and trifling romances; the examples they exhibit are thoſe of certain delirious *fanatics*, whom they call *ſaints*, men of a corrupt and perverted judgment, who offered violence to reaſon and nature by the horrors of an extravagant auſterity in their own conduct, and by the ſeverity of thoſe ſingular and inhuman rules which they preſcribed to others. For, by what means were theſe men *fainted?* By ſtarving themſelves with a frantic obſtinacy, and bearing the uſeleſs hardſhips of hunger, thirſt, and inclement ſeaſons, with ſtedfaſtneſs and perſeverance; by running about the country like madmen in tattered garments, and ſometimes half-naked, or ſhutting themſelves up in a narrow ſpace, where they continued motionleſs; by ſtanding for a long time in certain poſtures, with their eyes cloſed, in the enthuſiaſtic expectation of divine light. All this was ſaint-like and glorious; and the more that any ambitious fanatic departed from the dictates of reaſon and common ſenſe, and counterfeited the wild geſtures and the incoherent conduct of an ideot, or a lunatic, the ſurer was his proſpect of obtaining an eminent rank among the heroes and demigods of a corrupt and degenerate church.

Polemic divinity.

VIII. Many writers laboured with diligence to terminate the reigning controverſies, but none with ſucceſs. Nor ſhall we be much ſurpriſed, that theſe efforts were ineffectual, when we conſider how they were conducted; for ſcarcely can we name a ſingle writer, whoſe oppoſition to the Eutychians, Neſtorians, and Pelagians, was carried on with probity, moderation, or prudence. PRIMASIUS and PHILOPONUS wrote concerning all the ſects, but their works are loſt; the treatiſe of LEONTIUS, upon the ſame extenſive ſubject, is ſtill extant, but is ſcarcely worth peruſing. ISIDORE of *Seville*, and LEONTIUS of *Neapolis*, diſputed againſt the Jews, but with what ſucceſs and

CENT. VI. PART II.

dexterity will be eaſily imagined by thoſe who are acquainted with the learning and logic of theſe times. We omit, therefore, any further mention of the miſerable diſputants of this century, from a perſuaſion that it will be more uſeful and entertaining to lay before the reader a brief account of the controverſies that now divided and troubled the Chriſtian church.

The controverſies concerning Origen and his doctrine, renewed.

IX. Though the credit of ORIGEN, and his ſyſtem, ſeemed to lie expiring under the blows it had received from the zeal of the orthodox, and the repeated thunder of ſynods and councils, yet it was very far from being totally ſunk. On the contrary, this great man, and his doctrine, were held by many, and eſpecially by the monks, in the higheſt veneration, and cheriſhed with a kind of enthuſiaſm which became boundleſs and extravagant. In the weſt, BELLATOR tranſlated the works of ORIGEN into the Latin language. In the eaſtern provinces, and particularly in *Syria* and *Paleſtine*, which were the principal ſeats of Origeniſm, the monks, ſeconded by ſeveral biſhops, and chiefly by THEODORE of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, defended the truth and authority of the doctrines of ORIGEN againſt all his adverſaries with incredible vehemence and contention of mind [*i*]. The cauſe was, at length, brought before JUSTINIAN, who, in a long and verboſe edict, addreſſed to MENNAS patriarch of *Conſtantinople* [*k*], paſſed a ſevere condemnation upon ORIGEN and his doctrine, and ordered it to be entirely ſuppreſſed [*l*]. The effects of this edict were

[*i*] CYRILLUS, *Scythopolis, in Vita Sabæ*, which is to be found in COTELERIUS, *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, p. 370. HENR. NORIS, *Diſſertat. de Synodo Quinta*, cap. i, ii. p. 554. tom. i. opp.

[*k*] This edict is publiſhed in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 243.

☞ [*l*] This edict was procured by the ſolicitation of PELAGIUS, who was legate of VIGILIUS at the court of *Conſtantinople*,

were more violent than durable; for, upon the breaking out of the controverſy concerning the *three chapters* [*m*], ſoon after this time, Origeniſm was not only revived in *Paleſtine*, but even recovered new vigour, and ſpread itſelf far and wide. Hence many commotions were raiſed in the church, which were, however, terminated by the fifth general council, aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* by JUSTINIAN, A. D. 533, and in which ORIGEN and his followers were again condemned [*n*].

The controverſy concerning the three chapters.

X. This controverſy produced another, which continued much longer, was carried on with ſtill more exceſſive degrees of animoſity and violence, and the ſubject of which was of much leſs moment and importance. The emperor JUSTINIAN was eagerly bent upon extirpating that violent branch of the Monophyſites, which was diſtinguiſhed by the name of Acephali; and conſulted, upon this matter, THEODORE biſhop of *Cæſarea*, who was a Monophyſite, and, at the ſame time, extremely attached to the doctrine of ORIGEN. The artful prelate conſidered this as a favourable opportunity of procuring repoſe to the followers of ORIGEN by exciting a new controverſy, as alſo of caſting a reproach upon the council of *Chalcedon*, and giving a mortal blow to the Neſtorians

ſtantinople, with a view to confound the Acephali, who were admirers of ORIGEN, and particularly to vex THEODORE, of whoſe credit with the Emperor, PELAGIUS was extremely jealous. It was to return this affront, as well as to effect the purpoſes mentioned in the following ſection, that THEODORE ſet on foot the controverſy concerning the *three chapters*, which produced ſuch tedious, cruel, and fatal diſſenſions in the church. See BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, livr. x. ch. vi. p. 520.

[*m*] For an explication of what is meant by the *three chapters*, ſee note [*o*] of the Xth ſection.

[*n*] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 283. EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. BASNAGE, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, livr. x. chap. vi. p. 517, &c. PET. DAN. HUETII *Origeniana*, lib. ii. 224. DOUCIN's *Singular. Diſſ.* which is ſubjoined to his *Hiſtoria Origeniana*, p. 345.

CENT. VI. PART II.

and their cauſe. In order, therefore, to effect theſe three important purpoſes, he perſuaded the emperor that the Acephali would return to the boſom of the church, under the following eaſy and reaſonable conditions; namely, "That thoſe "paſſages in the acts of the council of *Chalcedon*, "in which THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, THEODO-"RET of *Cyrus*, and IBAS of *Edeſſa*, had been "pronounced orthodox, ſhould be effaced; and "that the productions of theſe prelates, which "were known by the appellation of the *three* "*chapters* [*o*], as alſo other writings of theirs, "which diſcovered a manifeſt propenſity towards "the Neſtorian errors, ſhould be condemned "and prohibited." The emperor lent a propitious ear to the counſels of this prelate; and, by an edict publiſhed A. D. 544, ordered the *three chapters* to be condemned and effaced, without any prejudice, however, to the authority of the council of *Chalcedon* [*p*]. This edict was warmly oppoſed by the African and weſtern biſhops, and particularly by VIGILIUS, the Roman pontif, who conſidered it as highly injurious not only to the authority of the council now mentioned, but alſo

☞ [*o*] The pieces, that were diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of the *three chapters*, were, 1. The writings of THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*. 2. The books which THEODORET of *Cyrus* wrote againſt the *twelve Anathemas*, which CYRIL had publiſhed againſt the Neſtorians. 3. The letter which IBAS of *Edeſſa* had written to one MARIS a Perſian, concerning the council of *Epheſus* and the condemnation of NESTORIUS. Theſe writings were ſuppoſed to favour the Neſtorian doctrine, and ſuch, indeed, was their tendency. It is however to be obſerved, that THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia* lived before the time of NESTORIUS, and died not only in the communion of the church, but alſo in the higheſt reputation for his ſanctity. Nor were the writings of the other two either condemned or cenſured by the council of *Chalcedon*; nay, the faith of THEODORET and IBAS was there declared entirely orthodox. The deciſion of the council of *Conſtantinople*, in oppoſition to this, ſhews that councils, as well as doctors, differ.

[*p*] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 287, EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. p. 412.

to

to the memory of thoſe holy men whoſe writings and characters it covered with reproach [q]. Upon this, JUSTINIAN ordered VIGILIUS to repair immediately to *Conſtantinople*, that, having him in his power, he might compel him with more facility to acquieſce in the edict, and reject the *three chapters*; and this method was attended with ſucceſs, for the pontif yielded. On the other hand, the biſhops of *Africa* and *Illyricum* obliged VIGILIUS to retract his *judicatum*, by which, in a council of ſeventy biſhops, he had condemned the *three chapters* in obedience to the emperor. For they ſeparated themſelves from the communion of this pope, and refuſed to acknowledge him as one of their brethren; nay, treated him as an apoſtate, until he approved what he had been obliged to condemn. The effect of this retractation redoubled the zeal and violence of JUSTINIAN, who, by a ſecond edict, publiſhed A. D. 551, condemned anew the *three chapters*.

The œcumenical council.

XI. After many cabals, commotions, and diſſenſions, which were occaſioned by this trifling controverſy, it was thought proper to ſubmit the final deciſion of it to an aſſembly of the univerſal church. This aſſembly was accordingly ſummoned, by JUSTINIAN, to meet at *Conſtantinople*, A. D. 553, and is conſidered as the *fifth œcumenical*, or *general council*. The emperor gained his point here: for, beſides the doctrines of ORIGEN [r], the *three chapters*, the condemnation of which

[q] HEN. NORIS, *De ſynodo quinta*, cap. 10. p. 579. tom. i. opp. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. x. cap. vi. p. 523.

☞ [r] We do not find in the *acts* of this council any one which condemns the doctrines of ORIGEN. It is however generally imagined, that theſe doctrines were condemned by this aſſembly; and what gave riſe to this notion was probably the xv Greek canons yet extant, in which the principal errors of ORIGEN are condemned, and which are entitled the canons of the 160 fathers aſſembled in the council of *Conſtantinople*. The tenets of ORIGEN, which gave the moſt offence, were

CENT. VI. PART II.

which he had ſolely in view, were, by the biſhops of the eaſt (for there were very few weſtern prelates preſent at this council), declared heretical and pernicious. VIGILIUS, who was now at *Conſtantinople*, refuſed his aſſent to the decrees of this council; for which reaſon, after having received various affronts, he was ſent into exile, from whence he was not permitted to return before he had acquieſced in the deciſions of this aſſembly [*s*]; and, changing his ſentiments for the fourth time, had declared the opinions contained in the *three chapters* to be execrable blaſphemies. His ſucceſſor PELAGIUS, and all the Roman pontifs that have ſince lolled in the papal chair, adhered to the decrees of this council; but neither their authority, nor that of the emperor, could prevail upon the weſtern biſhops to follow their example in this reſpect. Many of theſe, on the contrary, carried matters ſo far as to ſeparate themſelves from the communion of the pope on this account; and the diviſions, that aroſe from hence in the church, were too violent to admit of an expeditious or eaſy reconciliation, and could only be healed by length of time [*t*].

XII. An-

the following: 1. That, in the Trinity, the *Father* is greater than the *Son*, and the *Son* than the Holy Ghoſt. 2. The *pre-exiſtence* of ſouls, which ORIGEN conſidered as ſent into mortal bodies for the puniſhment of ſins committed in a former ſtate of being. 3. That the *ſoul* of CHRIST was united to the *word* before the incarnation. 4. That the ſun, moon, and ſtars, *&c.* were animated and endowed with rational ſouls. 5. That after the reſurrection all bodies will be of a round figure. 6. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that, as Chriſt had been crucified in this world to ſave mankind, he is to be crucified in the next to ſave the devils.

[*s*] See PETR. DE MARCA, *Diſſert. de decreto Vigilii pro confirmatione Synodi* V. which is to be found among the *Diſſertations* ſubjoined to his learned work, *De concordia ſacerdotii et imperii.*

[*t*] The beſt account of this matter is to be found in NORIS, *De ſynodo quinta œcumenica*, though even this excellent author cannot

CENT. VI. PART II.

XII. Another controverſy of much more importance had been carried on before this period among the Greeks; it was firſt kindled in the year 519, and it aroſe upon the following queſtion: *Whether it could be ſaid, with propriety, that* ONE OF THE TRINITY *ſuffered on the Croſs?* This was deſigned to embarraſs the Neſtorians, who ſeemed to ſeparate too much the two natures in CHRIST; and the Scythian monks, who ſeconded this deſign, and to whom the riſe of this controverſy is principally to be imputed, maintained the affirmative of this nice and difficult queſtion. Others aſſerted, on the contrary, that this manner of ſpeaking was by no means to be adopted, ſince it bordered upon the erroneous expreſſions and tenets of the Theopaſchites, who compoſed one of the ſects into which the Eutychians were ſubdivided [*u*]. This latter opinion was confirmed by HORMISDAS the Roman pontif, to whom the Scythian monks had appealed in vain; but this, inſtead of allaying the heat of the preſent controverſy, only added new fuel to the flame. JOHN II. who was one of the ſucceſſors of HORMISDAS, approved the propoſition which the latter had condemned; and confirming the opinion of the Scythian monks, expoſed the deciſions of the papal oracle to the laughter of the wiſe; his ſentence was afterwards approved by the fifth general council; and thus peace was reſtored in the church

The queſtion, whether one of the Trinity may be ſaid to have ſuffered? debated.

cannot be vindicated from the imputation of a certain degree of partiality. See alſo CHRIST. LUPUS, *Not. ad concilium quintum*, in his *Ad concilia Adnotat.*

☞ [*u*] The deacon VICTOR, and thoſe who oppoſed the Scythian monks, expreſſed their opinion in the following propoſition: viz. *One* PERSON *of the Trinity ſuffered in the fleſh.* Both ſides received the council of *Chalcedon*, acknowledged *two natures* in CHRIST, in oppoſition to EUTYCHES; and only one perſon in oppoſition to NESTORIUS; and yet, by a torrent of jargon, and a long chain of unintelligible ſyllogiſms, the Scythian monks accuſed their adverſaries of Neſtorianiſm, and were accuſed by them of the Eutychian hereſy.

CENT. VI. PART II.

church by the concluſion of theſe unintelligible diſputes [ω].

With the queſtion now mentioned, there was another cloſely and intimately connected, namely, *Whether the* PERSON *of* CHRIST *could be conſidered as* COMPOUNDED? Of this queſtion the Scythian monks maintained the affirmative, and their adverſaries the negative.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Rites multiplied.

IN this century the cauſe of true religion ſunk apace, and the gloomy reign of ſuperſtition extended itſelf in proportion to the decay of genuine piety. This lamentable decay was ſupplied by a multitude of rites and ceremonies. In the eaſt the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies gave occaſion to the invention of various rites and external inſtitutions, which were uſed as marks to diſtinguiſh from each other the contending parties. The weſtern churches were loaded with rites by GREGORY the GREAT, who had a marvellous fecundity of genius in inventing, and an irreſiſtible force of eloquence in recommending ſuperſtitious obſervances. Nor will this appear ſurpriſing to thoſe who know, that, in the opinion of this pontif, the *words* of the ſacred writings were *images* of myſterious and inviſible

[ω] See NORISII *Hiſtoria controverſiæ de uno ex Trinitate paſſo*, tom. iii. opp. p. 771. The ancient writers who mention this controverſy, call the monks, who ſet it on foot, Scythians. But LA CROZE, in his *Theſaur. Epiſt.* tom. iii. p. 189. imagines, that the country of theſe monks was *Egypt*, and not *Scythia*; and this conjecture is ſupported by reaſons which carry in them, at leaſt, a high degree of probability.

things;

things; for ſuch as embrace this chimerical ſyſtem will eaſily be led to expreſs all the doctrines and precepts of religion by external rites and ſymbols. GREGORY, indeed, is worthy of praiſe in this, that he did not pretend to force others to the obſervance of his inventions; though this, perhaps, was as much owing to a want of power, as to a principle of moderation.

The occaſions of them inveſtigated.

II. This prodigious augmentation of rites and ceremonies rendered an augmentation of doctors and interpreters of theſe myſteries indiſpenſably neceſſary. Hence a new kind of ſcience aroſe, which had, for its object, the explication of theſe ceremonies, and the inveſtigation of the cauſes and circumſtances from whence they derived their origin. But the moſt of thoſe, who entered into theſe reſearches, never went to the fountain-head, to the true ſources of theſe idle inventions. They endeavoured to ſeek their origin in reaſon and Chriſtianity; but in this they deceived themſelves, or, at leaſt deluded others, and delivered to the world their own fancies, inſtead of letting them into the true cauſes of things. Had they been acquainted with the opinions and cuſtoms of remote antiquity, or ſtudied the pontifical law of the Greeks and Romans, they had come at the true origin of many inſtitutions, which were falſely looked upon as venerable and ſacred.

Public worſhip.

III. The public worſhip of God was as yet celebrated by every nation in its own language; but was enlarged, from time to time, by the addition of various hymns, and other things of that nature, which were conſidered as proper to enliven devotion by the power of novelty. GREGORY the GREAT preſcribed a new method of adminiſtering the Lord's ſupper, with a magnificent aſſemblage of pompous ceremonies; this inſtitution of his was called the *canon of the maſs*; and, if any are unwilling to give it the name of a *new* appoint-

The adminiſtration of the euchariſt.

CENT. VI. PART II.

appointment, they muſt, at leaſt, acknowledge that it was a conſiderable augmentation of the ancient canon for celebrating the euchariſt, and occaſioned a remarkable change in the adminiſtration of that ordinance. Many ages, however, paſſed before this *Gregorian canon* was adopted by all the Latin churches [x].

Baptiſm.

Baptiſm, except in caſes of neceſſity, was adminiſtered only on great feſtivals. We omit mentioning, for the ſake of brevity, the Litanies that were addreſſed to the ſaints, the different ſorts of ſupplications, the *ſtations*, or aſſemblies of GREGORY, the forms of conſecration, and other ſuch inſtitutions, which were contrived, in this century, to excite a ſpecies of external devotion, and to engage the outward ſenſes in religious worſhip. An enquiry into theſe matters would of itſelf deſerve to be made the ſubject of a ſeparate work.

IV. There was an incredible number of temples erected in honour of the ſaints, during this century, both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. The places ſet apart for public worſhip were already very numerous; but it was now that Chriſtians firſt began to conſider theſe ſacred edifices, as the means of purchaſing the favour and protection of the ſaints, and to be perſuaded that theſe departed ſpirits defended and guarded, againſt evils and calamities of every kind, the provinces, lands, cities, and villages, in which they were honoured with temples. The number of theſe temples were almoſt equalled by that of the feſtivals, which were now obſerved in the Chriſtian church, and many of which ſeem to have been inſtituted upon a Pagan model. To thoſe that were celebrated in the preceding century, were now added the feſtival of the *purification of the bleſſed Virgin*, invented with a deſign

[x] See THEOD. CHR. LILIENTHAL, *De canone miſſæ Gregoriano.*

to remove the uneaſineſs of the heathen converts on account of the loſs of their *lupercalia*, or feaſts of PAN, which had been formerly obſerved in the month of February, the feſtival of the *immaculate conception*, the day ſet apart to commemorate the birth of St. JOHN, and others leſs worthy of mention.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

I. THE various ſects which had fomented diviſions among Chriſtians in the early ages of the church, were far from being effectually ſuppreſſed or totally extirpated. Though they had been perſecuted and afflicted with an infinite diverſity of trials and calamities, yet they ſtill ſubſiſted, and continued to excite diſſenſions and tumults in many places. The Manicheans are ſaid to have gained ſuch a degree of influence among the Perſians, as to have corrupted even the ſon of CABADES, the monarch of that nation, who repaid their zeal in making proſelytes with a terrible maſſacre, in which numbers of that impious ſect periſhed in the moſt dreadful manner. Nor was *Perſia* the only country which was troubled with the attempts of the Manicheans to ſpread their odious doctrine; other provinces of the empire were, undoubtedly, infected with their errors, as we may judge from the book that was written againſt them by HERACLIAN biſhop of *Chalcedon* [y]. In *Gaul* and *Africa*, diſſenſions of a different kind prevailed; and the controverſy between the Semi-Pelagians and the diſciples

The remains of the ancient hereſies.

Manicheans.

Semi-Pelagians.

[y] See PHOTIUS, *Biblioth. Cod.* cxiv. p. 291.

of

CENT. VI. PART II.

of AUGUSTIN continued to divide the weſtern churches.

Donatiſts.

II. The Donatiſts enjoyed the ſweets of freedom and tranquillity, as long as the Vandals reigned in *Africa*; but the ſcene was greatly changed with reſpect to them, when the empire of theſe Barbarians was overturned in the year 534. They, however, ſtill remained in a ſeparate body, and not only held their church, but, towards the concluſion of this century, and particularly from the year 591, defended themſelves with new degrees of animoſity and vigour, and were bold enough to attempt the multiplication of their ſect. GREGORY, the Roman pontif, oppoſed theſe efforts with great ſpirit and aſſiduity; and as appears from his epiſtles [z], tried various methods of depreſſing this faction, which was pluming its wings anew, and menacing the revival of thoſe lamentable diviſions which it had formerly excited in the church. Nor was the oppoſition of the zealous pontif without effect; it ſeems on the contrary to have been attended with the deſired ſucceſs, ſince, in this century, the church of the Donatiſts dwindled away to nothing, and after this period no traces of it are any where to be found.

Arians.

III. Towards the commencement of this century, the Arians were triumphant in ſeveral parts of *Aſia*, *Africa*, and *Europe*. Many of the Aſiatic biſhops favoured them ſecretly, while their opinions were openly profeſſed, and their cauſe maintained, by the Vandals in *Africa*, the Goths in *Italy*, the Spaniards, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the greateſt part of the Gauls. It is true, the Greeks, who had received the decrees of the council of *Nice*, perſecuted and oppreſſed the

[z] See his *Epiſtles*, lib. iv. *ep.* xxxiv, xxxv. p. 714, 715. lib. vi. *ep.* lxv. p. 841. *ep.* xxxvii. p. 821. lib. ix. *ep.* liii. p. 972. lib. xi. *ep.* xlviii. p. 611. tom. ii. opp.

Arians wherever their influence and authority could reach; but the Nicenians, in their turn, were not leſs rigorouſly treated by their adverſaries, particularly in *Africa* and *Italy*, where they felt, in a very ſevere manner, the weight of the Arian power, and the bitterneſs of their reſentment [*a*].

The triumphs of Arianiſm were, however, but tranſitory; and its proſperous days were entirely eclipſed, when the Vandals were driven out of *Africa*, and the Goths out of *Italy*, by the arms of JUSTINIAN [*b*]. For the other Arian princes were eaſily induced to abandon, themſelves, the doctrine of that ſect; and not only ſo, but to employ the force of laws and the authority of councils to prevent its further progreſs among their ſubjects, and to extirpate it entirely out of their dominions. Such was the conduct of SIGISMOND king of the Burgundians; THEODIMIR king of the Suevi, who had ſettled in *Luſitania*; and RECCARED king of *Spain*. Whether the change wrought in theſe princes was owing to the force of reaſon and argument, or to the influence of hopes and fears, is a queſtion which we ſhall not pretend to determine. One thing, however, is certain; and that is, that, from this period, the Arian ſect declined apace, and could never after recover any conſiderable degree of ſtability and conſiſtence.

The ſtate of the Neſtorians.

IV. The Neſtorians, after having gained a firm footing in *Perſia*, and eſtabliſhed the patriarch, or head, of their ſect at *Seleucia*, extended their

[*a*] PROCOPIUS, *De bello Vandal.* lib. i. cap. viii. and *De bello Gothico*, lib. ii. cap. ii. EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iv. cap. xv.

[*b*] See MASCOVII *Hiſtoria German.* tom. ii. p. 76, 91. See alſo an account of the Barbarian kings, who abandoned Arianiſm, and received the doctrines of the Nicene council, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Martii, p. 275, and April. p. 134.

views

CENT. VI. PART II.

views further, and ſpread their doctrines, with a ſucceſs equal to the ardour of their zeal, through the provinces that lay beyond the limits of the Roman empire. There are yet extant authentic records, from which it appears, that, throughout all *Perſia*, as alſo in *India*, *Armenia*, *Arabia*, *Syria*, and other countries, there were vaſt numbers of Neſtorian churches, all under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Seleucia* [*c*]. It is true, indeed, that the Perſian monarchs were not all equally favourable to this growing ſect, and that ſome of them even perſecuted, with the utmoſt ſeverity, all thoſe who bore the Chriſtian name throughout their dominions [*d*]; but it is alſo true, that ſuch of theſe princes, as were diſpoſed to exerciſe moderation and benignity towards the Chriſtians, were much more indulgent to the Neſtorians, than to their adverſaries who adhered to the council of *Epheſus*, ſince the latter were conſidered as ſpies employed by the Greeks, with whom they were connected by the ties of religion.

Eutychian controverſies.

V. The Monophyſites, or Eutychians, flouriſhed alſo in this century, and had gained over to their doctrine a conſiderable part of the eaſtern provinces. The emperor ANASTASIUS was warmly attached to the doctrine and ſect of the Acephali, who were reckoned among the more rigid Monophyſites [*e*]; and, in the year 513, created patriarch of *Antioch*, in the room of FLAVIAN whom he had expelled from that ſee, SEVERUS, a learned

[*c*] COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES, *Topographiæ Chriſtianæ*, lib. ii. p. 125. which is to be found in MONTFAUCON's *Collectio nova PP. Græcorum.*

[*d*] Jos. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. part I. p. 109. 407. 411. 441. 449. tom. iii. part II. cap. v. § 2. p. 83.

[*e*] EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iii. cap. xxx. xliv, &c. THEODORUS the Reader, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. ii. p. 562. See alſo the *Index operum* SEVERI, as it ſtands collected from ancient MSS. in MONTFAUCON's *Bibliotheca Coiſliniana*, p. 53.

monk

monk of *Palestine*, from whom the Monophysites were called Severians [*f*]. This emperor exerted all his influence and authority to destroy the credit of the council of *Chalcedon* in the east, and to maintain the cause of those who adhered to the doctrine of *one nature* in CHRIST; and, by the ardour and vehemence of his zeal, he excited the most deplorable seditions and tumults in the church [*g*]. After the death of ANASTASIUS, which happened A. D. 518, SEVERUS was expelled in his turn; and the sect which the late emperor had maintained and propagated with such zeal and assiduity, was every where opposed and depressed by his successor JUSTIN, and the following emperors, in such a manner, that it seemed to be upon the very brink of ruin, notwithstanding that it had created SERGIUS patriarch in the place of SEVERUS [*b*].

VI. When the affairs of the Monophysites were in such a desperate situation, that almost all hope of their recovery was vanished, and their bishops were reduced, by death and imprisonment, to a very small number, an obscure man, whose name was JACOB, and who was distinguished from others so called, by the surname of BARADÆUS, or ZANZALUS, restored this expiring sect to its former prosperity and lustre [*i*]. This poor monk, the

Jacob Baradæus the restorer of the Monophysites.

[*f*] See Jos. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 47. 321. EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 127. 129, 130. 135. 138, &c.

[*g*] EVAGRIUS, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* lib. iii. cap. xxxiii. CYRIELUS, *vita Sabæ in* Jo. BAPT. COTELERII *Monument. Ecclesiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 312. BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ANASTASIUS.

[*b*] See ABULPHARAII *Series Patriarch. Antiochen. in* ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* &c. tom. ii. p. 323.

[*i*] See ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. ii. cap. viii. p. 62. 72. 326. 331. 414. EUSEBII RENAUD. *Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 119. 133. 425, and the *Liturgiæ Orient.* tom. ii. p. 333. 342. FAUSTUS NAIRONUS, *Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum monumentis*, part I. p. 40, 41.

grandeur of whoſe views was much above the obſcurity of his ſtation, and whoſe fortitude and patience no dangers could daunt, nor any labours exhauſt, was ordained to the epiſcopal office by a handful of captive biſhops, travelled on foot through the whole eaſt, eſtabliſhed biſhops and preſbyters every where, revived the drooping ſpirits of the Monophyſites, and produced ſuch an aſtoniſhing change in their affairs by the power of his eloquence, and by his incredible activity and diligence, that when he died biſhop of *Edeſſa*, A. D. 588, he left his ſect in a moſt flouriſhing ſtate in *Syria*, *Meſopotamia*, *Armenia*, *Egypt*, *Nubia*, *Abyſſinia*, and other countries [*k*]. This dexterous monk had prudence to contrive the means of ſucceſs, as well as activity to put them in execution; for he almoſt totally extinguiſhed all the animoſities, and reconciled all the factions, that had divided the Monophyſites; and when their churches grew ſo numerous in the eaſt, that they could not all be conveniently comprehended under the ſole juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Antioch*, he appointed, as his aſſiſtant, the primate of the eaſt, whoſe reſidence was at *Tagritis*, on the borders of *Armenia* [*l*]. The laborious efforts of JACOB were ſeconded in *Egypt*, and the adjacent countries, by THEODOSIUS biſhop of *Alexandria*; and he became ſo famous, that all the Monophyſites of the eaſt conſidered him as their ſecond parent and founder, and are to this day called Jacobites in honour of their new chief.

[*k*] Concerning the Nubians and Abyſſinians, ſee ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. ii. p. 330. LOND. *Voyage d'Abyſſinie*, tom. ii. p. 36. LUDOLPH. *Commentar. ad Hiſtoriam Ethiopicam*, p. 451. 461. 466.

[*l*] ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. 410. 414. 418. See alſo this learned writer's *Diſſertatio de Monophyſitis*, which is prefixed to the ſecond volume of the work now cited.

VII. Thus

VII. Thus it happened, that, by the imprudent zeal and violence which the Greeks employed in defending the truth, the Monophyſites gained conſiderable advantages, and, at length, obtained a ſolid and permanent ſettlement. From this period their ſect has been under the juriſdiction of the patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, who, notwithſtanding the difference of opinion which ſubſiſts, with reſpect to ſome points, between the Syrian and Egyptian Monophyſites, are extremely careful to maintain communion with each other both by letters and by the exchange of good offices. The primate of the Abyſſines is ſubject to the patriarch of *Alexandria*; and the primate of the eaſt, who reſides at *Tagritis*, is under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Antioch*. The Armenians are ruled by a biſhop of their own, and are diſtinguiſhed by certain opinions and rites from the reſt of the Monophyſites.

The ſtate of the Monophyſites.

VIII. The ſect of the Monophyſites, before it was thus happily eſtabliſhed, was torn with factions and inteſtine diſputes, and ſuffered, in a particular manner, from that nice and ſubtile controverſy concerning *the body of* CHRIST, which was kindled at *Alexandria*. JULIAN, biſhop of *Halicarnaſſus*, affirmed, A. D. 519, that the divine nature had ſo inſinuated itſelf into the body of CHRIST, from the very moment of the Virgin's conception, that the body of our Lord changed its nature, and became *incorruptible*. This opinion was alſo embraced by CAIANUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*: from whom thoſe who adopted it were called Caianiſts. They were, however, divided into three ſects, two of which debated this queſtion, Whether the body of CHRIST was *created* or *increated?* While the third aſſerted, that our Lord's body was indeed corruptible, but never actually corrupted, ſince the energy of the divine nature muſt have prevented its diſſolution.

Controverſies among the Monophyſites.

This ſect was warmly oppoſed by SEVERUS of *Antioch*, and DAMIANUS, who maintained that the body of CHRIST, before his reſurrection, was truly *corruptible*, i. e. ſubject to the affections and changes with which human nature is generally attended. Thoſe who embraced the opinion of JULIAN, were called Aphthartodocetæ, Docetæ, Phantaſiaſts, and even Manicheans, becauſe it was ſuppoſed to follow from their hypotheſis, that CHRIST did not ſuffer in *reality*, but only in *appearance*, hunger and thirſt, pain and death; and that he did not actually aſſume the common affections and properties of human nature. On the other hand, the votaries of SEVERUS were diſtinguiſhed by the names Phthartolatræ, Ktiſtolatræ, and Creaticolæ. This miſerable controverſy was carried on with great warmth under the reign of JUSTINIAN, who favoured the Aphthartodocetæ; ſoon after, it ſubſided gradually; and, at length, was happily huſhed in ſilence [*m*]. XENAIAS of *Hierapolis* ſtruck out an hypotheſis upon this knotty matter, which ſeemed equally remote from thoſe of the contending parties; for he maintained that CHRIST had, indeed, truly ſuffered the various ſenſations to which humanity is expoſed; but that he ſuffered them not in his *nature*, but by a ſubmiſſive act of his *will* [*n*].

The Agnoitæ.

IX. Some of the Corrupticolæ (for ſo *they* were called who looked upon the body of CHRIST to be corruptible), particularly THEMISTIUS, a deacon of *Alexandria*, and THEODOSIUS, a biſhop of that city, were carried by the inconſiderate heat

[*m*] TIMOTHEUS, *De receptione hæreticorum in* COTELERII *Monumentis Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 409. LIBERATUS, *in Breviario Controv.* cap. xx. FORBESII *Inſtructiones Hiſtorico Theologicæ*, lib. iii. cap. xviii. p. 108. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental.* tom. iii. part II. 457.

[*n*] ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 22. and 168.

of

of controverſy into another opinion, which produced new commotions in the church towards the concluſion of this century. They affirmed, that to the divine nature of CHRIST all things were known; but that from his human nature many things were concealed. The reſt of the ſect charged the authors of this opinion with imputing ignorance to the divine nature of CHRIST; ſince they held, in common with them, that there was but one nature in the Son of God. Hence the votaries of this new doctrine were called Agnoëtæ [o]; but their ſect was ſo weak and ill-ſupported, that, notwithſtanding their eloquence and activity, which ſeemed to promiſe better ſucceſs, it gradually declined, and came to nothing.

The Tritheiſts.

X. From the controverſies with the Monophyſites aroſe the ſect of the Tritheiſts, whoſe chief was JOHN ASCUSNAGE, a Syrian philoſopher, and at the ſame time a Monophyſite [p]. This man imagined in the Deity three natures, or ſubſtances, abſolutely equal in all reſpects, and joined together by no common *eſſence*; to which opinion his adverſaries gave the name of Tritheiſm. One of the warmeſt defenders of this doctrine was JOHN PHILOPONUS, an Alexandrian philoſopher and grammarian of the higheſt reputation; and hence he has been conſidered by many as the author of this ſect, whoſe members have conſequently derived from him the title of Philoponiſts [q].

[o] Jo. BAPT. COTELERIUS, *Ad Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 641. MICH. LE QUIEN, *Ad Damaſcenum de hæreſibus*, tom. i. p. 107. FORBES, *Inſtruction. Hiſtorico-Theolog.* lib. iii. cap. xix. p. 119. PHOTIUS, *Biblioth. Cod.* ccxxx. p. 882.

[p] See GREGOR. ABULPHARAJUS, *in* ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* tom. i. p. 328.

[q] See FABRICII *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. cap. xxxvii. p. 358. HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 1288. TIMOTHEUS, *De receptione hæreticorum in* COTELERII *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 414. Jo. DAMASCENUS, *De hæreſibus*, tom. i. opp. p. 103. edit. Le Quien.

This

This ſect was divided into two parties, the Philoponiſts and the Cononites; the latter of whom were ſo called from CONON biſhop of *Tarſus*, their chief [*r*]. They agreed in the doctrine of *three perſons* in the Godhead, and differed only in their manner of explaining what the ſcriptures taught concerning the reſurrection of the body. PHILOPONUS maintained that the *form*, as well as the *matter*, of all bodies was *generated* and *corrupted*, and that both therefore were to be reſtored in the reſurrection. CONON held, on the contrary, that the body never loſt its *form*: that its *matter* alone was ſubject to corruption and decay, and was conſequently to be reſtored when *this mortal ſhall put on immortality*.

A third faction was that of the DAMIANISTS, who were ſo called from DAMIAN biſhop of *Alexandria*, and whoſe opinion concerning the Trinity was different from thoſe already mentioned. They diſtinguiſhed the *divine eſſence* from the *three perſons*, viz. the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. They denied that each perſon was God, when conſidered in itſelf and abſtractedly from the other two; but they affirmed, at the ſame time, that there was a *common divinity*, by the joint participation of which each perſon was God. They therefore called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, hypoſtaſes, or perſons, and the *Godhead*, which was common to them all, *ſubſtance* or *nature* [*s*].

[*r*] PHOTII *Biblioth. Cod.* xxiv. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 329.

[*s*] Jos. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 78. 332, &c.

THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the church during this century.

I. IN this century, the progreſs of Chriſtianity was mightily accelerated both in the eaſtern and weſtern hemiſpheres, and its divine light was diffuſed far and wide through the darkened nations. The Neſtorians, who dwelt in *Syria*, *Perſia*, and *India*, contributed much to its propagation in the eaſt, by the zeal and diligence, the laborious efforts and indefatigable aſſiduity, with which they preached it to theſe fierce and barbarous nations, who lived in the remoteſt borders and deſerts of *Aſia*, and among whom, as we learn from authentic records, their miniſtry was crowned with remarkable ſucceſs. It was by the labours of this ſect, that the light of the goſpel firſt penetrated into the immenſe empire of *China*, about the year 637, when JESUIABAS of *Gadala* was at the head of the Neſtorians, as will appear probable to thoſe who look upon as genuine the famous Chineſe monument, which was diſcovered at

CENT. VII. PART I.

The Chriſtian religion introduced into *China*.

CENT. VII. PART I.

Siganfu, by the Jeſuits during the laſt century [*a*]. Some, indeed, look upon this monument to be a mere forgery of the Jeſuits, though, perhaps, without reaſon; there are, however, other unexceptionable proofs, that the northern parts of *China*, even before this century, abounded with Chriſtians, who, for many ſucceeding ages, were under the inſpection of a Metropolitan ſent them by the Chaldean or Neſtorian patriarch [*b*].

II. The

[*a*] This celebrated monument has been publiſhed and explained by ſeveral learned writers, particularly by KIRCHER, in his *China illuſtrata*, p. 53; by MULLER, in a treatiſe publiſhed at *Berlin* in 1672; by EUSEBE RENAUDOT, in his *Relations anciennes des Indes et de la Chine, de deux voyageurs Mahometans*, p. 228—271, publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1718, in 8vo; and by ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. pars II. cap. iv. § 7. p. 538. We were promiſed a ſtill more accurate edition of this famous monument by the learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED BAYER, the greateſt proficient of this age in Chineſe erudition; but his death has blaſted our expectations. For my part, I ſee no reaſon to doubt of the genuineneſs of this monument, nor can I underſtand what advantage could redound to the Jeſuits from the invention of ſuch a fable. See LIRON, *Singularités Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. ii. p. 500.

[*b*] See RENAUDOT, l. c. p. 56. 68, &c. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth.* &c. cap. ix. p. 522: the learned BAYER, in his Preface to his *Muſeum Sinicum*, p. 84, aſſures us, that he has in his hands ſuch proofs of the truth of what is here affirmed, as puts the matter beyond all doubt. ☞ See on this ſubject a very learned diſſertation publiſhed by M. DE GUIGNES in the xxxth vol. of the *Memoires de Litterature tirés des Regiſtres de l' Academie Royale des Inſcriptions et Belles Lettres*, in which he proves that the Chriſtians were ſettled in *China* ſo early as the VIIth Century. He remarks, indeed, that the Neſtorians and other Chriſtians were for a long time confounded, in the Chineſe annals, with the worſhippers of *Fo* an Indian Idol, whoſe rites were introduced into *China* about 65 years after the birth of Chriſt; and that this circumſtance has deceived *De la Croze*, *Beauſobre*, and ſome other learned men, who have raiſed ſpecious objections againſt the hypotheſis that maintains the early introduction of Chriſtianity into this great empire. A reader, properly informed, will lend little or no attention to t : r.

count

II. The attention and activity of the Greeks were ſo entirely occupied by their inteſtine diviſions, that they were little ſolicitous about the progreſs of Chriſtianity. In the weſt, AUGUSTIN laboured to extend the limits of the church, and to ſpread the light of the goſpel among the Anglo-Saxons; and, after his death, other monks were ſent from *Rome* to exert themſelves in the ſame glorious cauſe. Their efforts were attended with the deſired ſucceſs, and the efficacy of their labours was manifeſted in the converſion of the ſix Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto remained under the darkneſs of the ancient ſuperſtitions, to the Chriſtian faith, which gained ground by degrees, and was, at length, embraced univerſally throughout all *Britain* [c]. We are not, however, to imagine, that this univerſal change in favour of Chriſtianity was wholly due to the diſcourſes of the Roman monks and doctors; for other cauſes were certainly inſtrumental in accompliſhing this great event. And it is not to be doubted, that the influence which ſome chriſtian queens and ladies of high diſtinction had upon their huſbands, and the pains they took to convert them to Chriſtianity, as alſo the ſevere and rigorous laws that were afterwards enacted againſt idolaters [d], contributed much to the progreſs of the goſpel.

The English converted.

III. Many of the Britiſh, Scotch, and Iriſh eccleſiaſtics travelled among the Batavian, Belgic, and German nations, with the pious intention of

As alſo the Gauls, the Suevi, the Frieſlanders, the Franks, and the Helvetii.

count given of this matter by Voltaire in the firſt volume of his *Eſſai ſur l' Hiſtoire Generale, &c.* A *Poet*, who recounts facts, or denies them, without deigning to produce his authorities, muſt not expect to meet with the credit that is due to an Hiſtorian.

[c] BEDÆ *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſt. Gentis Anglor.* lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 91. cap. xiv. p. 116, lib. iii. cap. xxi. p. 162, &c. edit. Chiſleti. RAPIN THOYRAS, tom. i. p. 227.

[d] WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 22.

propagating

CENT. VII. PART I.

propagating the knowledge of the truth, and of erecting churches and forming religious eſtabliſhments every where. This was the true reaſon which induced the Germans, in after-times, to found ſo many convents for the Scotch and Iriſh, of which ſome are yet in being [*e*].

COLUMBAN, an Iriſh monk, ſeconded by the labours of a few companions, had happily extirpated, in the preceding century, the ancient ſuperſtitions in *Gaul*, and the parts adjacent, where idolatry had taken the deepeſt root; he alſo carried the lamp of celeſtial truth among the Suevi, the Boii, the Franks, and other German nations [*f*], and perſevered in theſe pious and uſeful labours until his death, which happened A. D. 615. St. GAL, who was one of his companions, preached the goſpel to the Helvetii, and the Suevi [*g*]. St. KILIAN ſet out from *Scotland*, the place of his nativity, and exerciſed the miniſterial function with ſuch ſucceſs among the eaſtern Franks, that vaſt numbers of them embraced Chriſtianity [*h*]. Towards the concluſion of this century, the famous WILLEBRORD, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied with eleven of his countrymen, *viz.* SUIDBERT, WIGBERT, ACCA, WILIBALD, UNIBALD, LEBWIN, the two EWALDS, WERENFRID, MARCELLIN, and ADALBERT, croſſed over into *Batavia*, which lay oppoſite to *Britain*, in order to convert the Frieſlanders to the religion of JESUS. From thence, in the year 692, they

[*e*] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Febr. p. 362.

[*f*] MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ordinis Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 560. tom. iii. p. 72. 339 500. ADAMANNI, lib. iii. *De S. Columbano, in* CANISII *Lection. Antiq.* tom. i. p. 674.

[*g*] WALAFRIDI STRABONIS *vit. S.* GALLI *in* MABILLON. *Actis S. Ord. Benedict.* tom. ii, p. 228. CANISII *Lection. Antiq.* tom. i. p. 783.

[*h*] *Vita S.* KILIANI *in* CANISII *Lection. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 171. Jo PET. DE LUDEWIG, *Scriptores rerum Wurzburgenſ.* p. 966.

went

went into *Foſteland*, which moſt writers look upon to have been the ſame with the iſle of *Helgoland*, or *Heiligland*; but being cruelly treated there by RADBOD, king of the Frieſlanders, who put WIGBERT, one of the company, to death, they departed hence for *Cimbria*, and the adjacent parts of *Denmark*. They, however, returned to *Frieſland* A. D. 693, and were much more ſucceſsful than they had formerly been in oppoſing the ancient ſuperſtitions, and propagating the knowledge of the truth. WILLEBRORD was ordained, by the Roman pontif, archbiſhop of *Wilteburg*, now *Utrecht*, and died among the Batavians in a good old age: while his aſſociates continued to ſpread the light of the goſpel among the Weſtphalians, and the neighbouring countries [*i*].

The judgment we are to form of theſe apoſtles.

IV. Theſe voyages, and many others, undertaken in the cauſe of CHRIST, carry, no doubt, a ſpecious appearance of piety and zeal; but the impartial and attentive enquirer after truth will find it impoſſible to form the ſame favourable judgment of them all, or to applaud, without diſtinction, the motives that animated theſe laborious miſſionaries. That the deſigns of ſome of them were truly pious, and their characters without reproach, is unqueſtionably certain. But it is equally certain, that this was neither the caſe of them all, nor even of the greateſt part of them. Many of them diſcovered, in the courſe of their miniſtry, the moſt turbulent paſſions, and diſhonoured the glorious cauſe in which they were engaged, by their arrogance and ambition, their avarice and cruelty. They abuſed the power, which they had received from the Roman pontifs, of forming religious eſtabliſhments among the ſuperſtitious nations; and, inſtead of gaining

[*i*] ALCUINI *vita Willibrordi in* MABILLON. *Actis SS. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* iii. pars I. p. 603. Jo. MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 980.

ſouls

CENT. VI. PART I.

ſouls to CHRIST, they uſurped a deſpotic dominion over their obſequious proſelytes; and exerciſed a princely authority over the countries where their miniſtry had been ſucceſsful. Nor are we to conſider as entirely groundleſs, the ſuſpicions of thoſe who allege, that many of the monks, deſirous of rule and authority, concealed their vices under the maſk of religion, and endured, for a certain time, the auſterities of a rigid mortification and abſtinence, merely with a view to riſe in the church to the epiſcopal dignity.

The Jews compelled to embrace Chriſtianity.

V. The converſion of the Jews ſeemed at a ſtand in this century; few or none of that obſtinate nation embraced the goſpel in conſequence of an inward conviction of its truth, though in many places they were barbarouſly compelled, by the Chriſtians, to make an outward and feigned profeſſion of their faith in CHRIST. The emperor HERACLIUS, incenſed againſt that miſerable people by the inſinuations, as it is ſaid, of the Chriſtian doctors, perſecuted them in a cruel manner, and ordered multitudes of them to be inhumanly dragged into the Chriſtian churches, in order to be baptized by violence and compulſion [*k*]. The ſame odious method of converting was practiſed in *Spain* and *Gaul*, by the monarchs of thoſe nations, againſt which even the biſhops of *Rome* expreſſed their diſpleaſure and indignation. Such were the horrid and abominable practices to which an ignorance of the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, and the barbarous genius of this age, led the heralds of that divine religion, which was deſigned to ſpread abroad CHARITY upon earth, and to render mankind truly and rationally FREE.

[*k*] EUTYCHII *Annales Eccleſiaſt. Alexandr.* tom. ii. p. 212.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. VII. PART I.

I. THE Chriſtians ſuffered leſs in this, than in the preceding centuries. They were ſometimes perſecuted by the Perſian monarchs, but ſtill recovered their former tranquillity after tranſitory ſcenes of violence and oppreſſion. In *England*, the new converts to Chriſtianity ſuffered various calamities under the petty kings, who governed in thoſe boiſterous times; but theſe kings embraced the goſpel themſelves, and then the ſufferings of the Chriſtians ceaſed. In the eaſtern countries, and particularly in *Syria* and *Paleſtine*, the Jews, at certain times, attacked the Chriſtians with a mercileſs fury (*l*); but, however, with ſo little ſucceſs, that they always had reaſon to repent of their temerity, which was ſeverely chaſtiſed. It is true, the church had other enemies, even thoſe who, under the treacherous profeſſion of Chriſtianity, were laying ſecret ſchemes for the reſtoration of Paganiſm; but they were too weak and too inconſiderable to form any attempts that could endanger the Chriſtian cauſe.

Mahomet appears.

II. But a new and moſt powerful enemy to the Chriſtian cauſe ſtarted up in *Arabia* A. D. 612, under the reign of HERACLIUS. This was MAHOMET, an illiterate man [*m*], but endowed by nature

[*l*] EUTYCHII *Annales*, tom. ii. p. 236. Jo. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hiſtoria Orientalis*, lib. i. cap. iii. p. 129.

[*m*] Mahomet himſelf expreſsly declared, that he was totally ignorant of all branches of learning and ſcience, and was even unable either to write or read: and his followers have drawn from this ignorance an argument in favour of the divinity of his miſſion, and of the religion he taught. It is, however, ſcarcely credible, that his ignorance was ſuch as it is

here

CENT. VII. PART I.

nature with the moſt flowing and attractive eloquence, and with a vaſt and penetrating genius [*n*], diſtinguiſhed alſo by the advantages he enjoyed from the place of his birth, which added a luſtre to his name and his undertakings. This adventurous impoſtor declared publicly, that he was commiſſioned, by God, to deſtroy polytheiſm and idolatry, and then to reform, firſt, the religion of the Arabians, and afterwards the Jewiſh and Chriſtian worſhip. For theſe purpoſes he delivered a new law, which is known by the name of the *Koran* [*o*], or *Alcoran*; and having gained ſeveral

here deſcribed, and ſeveral of his ſect have called in queſtion the declarations of their chief relating to this point. See CHARDIN, *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. iv. p. 33, 34. If we conſider that MAHOMET carried on, for a conſiderable time, a ſucceſsful commerce in *Arabia*, and the adjacent countries, this alone will convince us, that he muſt have been, in ſome meaſure, inſtructed in the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, with the knowledge of which a merchant cannot diſpenſe.

[*n*] The writers, to whom we are indebted for accounts of the life and religion of MAHOMET, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Delectus et Syllabus argumentor. pro veritate relig. Chriſtianæ*, cap. I. p. 733. To which we may add, BOULAINVILLIERS, *Vie de Mahomet*, publiſhed at *London*, in 8vo, in the year 1730, and which deſerves rather the character of a romance, than of a hiſtory: GAGNIER, *Vie de Mahomet*, printed at *Amſterdam*, in two volumes, 8vo, in 1732, and commendable both for the learning and candour with which it appears to have been compoſed; and, above all, the moſt learned and judicious SALE's *Preliminary Diſcourſe*, prefixed to his *Engliſh tranſlation of the Koran*, § 2. p. 37.

[*o*] For an account of the *Koran*, ſee principally the learned SALE's Pre. his Engliſh tranſlation of that work. See alſo VERTOT's *Discours ſur l' Alcoran*, which is ſubjoined to the third volume of his *Hiſtory of the Knights of Malta*, and CHARDIN's *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 281. The book, which the Mahometans call the *Koran*, or *Alcoran*, is compoſed of ſeveral papers and diſcourſes of MAHOMET, which were diſcovered and collected after his death, and is by no means that fame *law*, whoſe excellence MAHOMET vaunted ſo highly. That ſome parts of the true *Koran* may be copied in the modern one, is indeed very poſſible; but that the *Koran*,

or

veral victories over his enemies; he compelled an incredible multitude of perſons, both in *Arabia* and the neighbouring nations, to receive his doctrine, and range themſelves under his ſtandards. Elated with this rapid and unexpected ſucceſs, he extended yet further his ambitious views, and formed the vaſt and arduous project of founding an empire. Here again ſucceſs crowned his adventurous efforts; and his plan was executed with ſuch intrepidity and impudence, that he died maſter of all *Arabia*, beſides ſeveral adjacent provinces.

What judgment we are to form of Mahomet.

III. It is, perhaps, impoſſible, at this time, to form ſuch an accurate judgment of the character, views, and conduct of MAHOMET, as would entirely ſatisfy the curioſity of a ſagacious inquirer after truth. To give entire credit to the Grecian writers in this matter, is neither prudent nor ſafe, ſince their bitter reſentment againſt this hoſtile invader led them to invent, without ſcruple or heſitation, fables and calumnies to blacken his character. The Arabians, on the other hand, are as little to be truſted to; as their hiſtorians are deſtitute of veracity and candour, conceal the vices and enormities of their chief, and repreſent him as the moſt divine perſon that ever appeared upon earth, and as the beſt gift of God to the world. Add to this, that a conſiderable part of MAHOMET's life, and indeed that part of it that would be the moſt proper to lead us to a true

or *Law*, given by Mahomet to the Arabians, is entirely diſtinct from the modern *Alcoran*, is manifeſt from this, that in the latter, MAHOMET appeals to and extols the former, and therefore they muſt be two different compoſitions. May it not be conjectured, that the true *Koran* was an Arabic poem, which MAHOMET recited to his followers without giving it to them in writing, ordering them only to commit it to their memory? Such were the laws of the Druids in *Gaul*, and ſuch alſo thoſe of the Indians, which the Bramins receive by oral tradition, and get by heart.

knowledge

knowledge of his character, and of the motives from which he acted, is abſolutely unknown. It is highly probable, that he was ſo deeply affected with the odious and abominable ſuperſtition which diſhonoured his country, that it threw him into a certain fanatical diſorder of mind, and made him really imagine that he was ſupernaturally commiſſioned to reform the religion of the Arabians, and to reſtore among them the worſhip of one God. It is, however, at the ſame time, undoubtedly evident, that, when he ſaw his enterprize crowned with the deſired ſucceſs, he made uſe of impious frauds to eſtabliſh the work he had ſo happily begun, deluded the giddy and credulous multitude by various artifices, and even forged celeſtial viſions to confirm his authority, and remove the difficulties that frequently aroſe in the courſe of his affairs. This mixture of impoſture is, by no means, incompatible with a ſpirit of enthuſiaſm; for the fanatic, through the unguided warmth of zeal, looks often upon the artifices that are uſeful to his cauſe, as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being; and therefore deceives when he can do it with impunity [*p*]. The religion which MAHOMET taught, is certainly different from what it would have been, if he had met with no oppoſition in the propagation of his opinions. The difficulties he had to encounter obliged him to yield, in ſome reſpects, to the reigning ſyſtems; the obſtinate attachment of the Arabians to the religion of their anceſtors on the one hand, and the fond hope of gaining over to his cauſe both the Jews and Chriſtians on

[*p*] This, methinks, is the beſt way of adjuſting the controverſy that has been carried on by ſome learned men upon this curious queſtion, *viz.* Whether MAHOMET was a fanatic, or an impoſtor? See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article MAHOMET. OCKLEY's *Conqueſt of Syria, Perſia, and Egypt, by the Saracens*, vol. i. p. 62. SALE's Preface to his tranſlation of the *Alcoran*, § 2. p. 39.

the

the other, engaged, no doubt, this fanatical impoſtor to admit into his ſyſtem ſeveral tenets, which he would have rejected without heſitation, had he been free from the reſtraints of ambition and artifice.

IV. The rapid ſucceſs which attended the propagation of this new religion, was owing to cauſes that are plain and evident, and muſt remove, or rather prevent, our ſurprize, when they are attentively conſidered. The terror of MAHOMET's arms, and the repeated victories which were gained by him and his ſucceſſors, were, no doubt, the irreſiſtible argument that perſuaded ſuch multitudes to embrace his religion, and ſubmit to his dominion. Beſides, his law was artfully and marvellouſly adapted to the corrupt nature of man; and, in a more particular manner, to the manners and opinions of the eaſtern nations, and the vices to which they were naturally addicted; for the articles of faith which it propoſed were few in number, and extremely ſimple; and the duties it required were neither many nor difficult, nor ſuch as were incompatible with the empire of appetites and paſſions [q]. It is to be obſerved further, that the groſs ignorance, under which the Arabians, Syrians, Perſians, and the greateſt part of the eaſtern nations, laboured at this time, rendered many an eaſy prey to the artifice and eloquence of this bold adventurer. To theſe cauſes of the progreſs of Mahometiſm, we may add the bitter diſſenſions and cruel animoſities that reigned among the Chriſtian ſects, particularly the Greeks, Neſtorians, Eutychians, and Monophyſites, diſſenſions that filled a great part of the eaſt with carnage, aſſaſſinations, and ſuch deteſtable enormities, as rendered the very name of Chriſtianity odious to many. We might add

The cauſes which contributed to the rapid progreſs of the Mahometan religion.

[q] See RELAND, *De religione Mahumedica.* SALE's *Preliminary diſcourſe.*

CENT. VII. PART I.

here, that the Monophyſites and Neſtorians, full of reſentment againſt the Greeks, from whom they had ſuffered the bittereſt and moſt injurious treatment, aſſiſted the Arabians in the conqueſt of ſeveral provinces [r], into which, of conſequence, the religion of MAHOMET was afterwards introduced. Other cauſes of the ſudden progreſs of that religion, will naturally occur to ſuch as conſider attentively its ſpirit and genius, and the ſtate of the world at this time.

The treatment which the Chriſtians received from the Mahometans.

V. After the death of MAHOMET, which happened A. D. 632, his followers, led on by an amazing intrepidity, and a fanatical fury, and aſſiſted, as we have already obſerved, by thoſe Chriſtians whom the Greeks had treated with ſuch ſeverity, extended their conqueſts beyond the limits of *Arabia*, and ſubdued *Syria*, *Perſia*, *Egypt*, and other countries under their dominion. On the other hand, the Greeks, exhauſted with civil diſcords, and wholly occupied by inteſtine troubles, were unable to ſtop theſe intrepid conquerors in their rapid career.

For ſome time theſe enthuſiaſtic invaders uſed their proſperity with moderation, and treated the Chriſtians, and particularly thoſe among them who rejected the decrees of the councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, with the utmoſt indulgence and lenity. But as an uninterrupted courſe of ſucceſs and proſperity renders, too generally, corrupt mortals inſolent and imperious, ſo the moderation of this victorious ſect degenerated by degrees into ſeverity; and they treated the Chriſtians, at length, rather like ſlaves than citizens, loading them with inſupportable taxes, and obliging them to ſubmit to a variety of vexatious and oppreſſive meaſures.

[r] See OCKLEY's *Conqueſt of Syria, Perſia, and Egypt by the Saracens*, the firſt part of which was publiſhed at *London* in the year 1708, and the ſecond in 1717.

VI. The

VI. The progreſs, however, of this triumphant ſect received a conſiderable check by the civil diſſenſions which aroſe among them immediately after the death of MAHOMET. ABUBEKER and ALI, the former the father-in-law, and the latter the ſon-in-law, of this pretended prophet, aſpired both to ſucceed him in the empire which he had erected. Upon this aroſe a tedious and cruel conteſt, whoſe flame reached to ſucceeding ages, and produced that ſchiſm which divided the Mahometans into two great factions, whoſe ſeparation not only gave riſe to a variety of opinions and rites, but alſo excited the moſt implacable hatred, and the moſt deadly animoſities. Of theſe factions, the one acknowledged ABUBEKER as the true *calif*, or ſucceſſor of MAHOMET, and its members were diſtinguiſhed by the name of Sonnites; while the other adhered to ALI, and were known by the title of Schiites (*s*). Both however adhered to the Alcoran as a divine law, and the rule of faith and manners; to which, indeed, the former added, by way of interpretation, the *ſonna*, i. e. a certain law which they looked upon as deſcended from MAHOMET by oral tradition, and which the Schiites refuſed to admit. Among the Sonnites, or followers of ABUBEKER, we are to reckon the Turks, Tartars, Arabians, Africans, and the greateſt part of the Indian Mahometans; whereas the Perſians and the ſubjects of the Grand Mogul are generally conſidered as the followers of ALI; though the latter indeed ſeem rather to obſerve a ſtrict neutrality in this conteſt.

The Mahometans divided.

Beſides theſe two grand factions, there are other ſubordinate ſects among the Mahometans, which diſpute with warmth concerning ſeveral points of

[*s*] See RELAND, *De religione Turcica*, lib. i. p. 36. 70. 74. 85. CHARDIN's *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 236.

CENT. VII. PART I.

religion, though without violating the rules of mutual toleration (*t*). Of theſe ſects there are four, which far ſurpaſs the reſt in point of reputation and importance.

[*t*] For an account of the Mahometan ſects, ſee HOTTINGER, *Hiſtor. Orient.* lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 340. RICAUT, *Etat. de l'empire Ottoman*, livr. ii. p. 242. CHARDIN's *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 263. SALE's *Preliminary Diſcourſe*, § 8. p. 151.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning.

I. NOTHING can equal the ignorance and darkneſs that reigned in this century; the moſt impartial and accurate account of which will appear incredible to thoſe who are unacquainted with the productions of this barbarous period. Any remains of learning and philoſophy that yet ſurvived, were, a few particular caſes excepted, to be found principally among the Latins, in the obſcure retreats of cloiſtered monks. The monaſtic inſtitutions prohibited the election of any abbot to the head of a convent, who was not a man of learning, or, at leaſt, endowed with a tolerable meaſure of the erudition of the times. The monks were obliged to conſecrate certain hours every day to reading and ſtudy: and, that they might improve this appointment to the moſt advantageous purpoſes, there were, in moſt of the monaſteries, ſtated times marked out, at which they were to aſſemble, in order to communicate to each other the fruits of their ſtudy, and to diſcuſs the matters upon which they had been reading [*a*]. The youth alſo, who were deſtined for the ſervice of the church, were obliged to prepare themſelves for their miniſtry by a diligent application to ſtudy; and in this they were directed by the monks,

[*a*] See MABILLON, *Acta S. S. Ord. Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 479. 513.

CENT. VII. PART II.

one of whoſe principal occupations it was to preſide over the education of the riſing prieſthood.

It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that all theſe inſtitutions were of little uſe to the advancement of ſolid learning, or of rational theology, becauſe very few in theſe days were acquainted with the true nature of the liberal arts and ſciences, or with the important ends which they were adapted to ſerve; and the greateſt part of thoſe who were looked upon as learned men, threw away their time in reading the marvellous lives of a parcel of fanatical ſaints, inſtead of employing it in the peruſal of well-choſen and excellent authors. They, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves moſt by their taſte and genius, carried their ſtudies little farther than the works of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY the GREAT: and it is of ſcraps collected out of theſe two writers, and patched together without much uniformity, that the beſt productions of this century are entirely compoſed.

The ignorance of the biſhops.

II. The ſciences enjoyed no degree of protection, at this time, from kings and princes, nor did they owe any thing to men of high and eminent ſtations in the empire. On the other hand, the ſchools which had been committed to the care and inſpection of the biſhops, whoſe ignorance and indolence were now become enormous, began to decline apace, and were, in many places, fallen into ruin [b]. The biſhops in general were ſo illiterate, that few of that body were capable of compoſing the diſcourſes which they delivered to the people. Such of them as were not totally deſtitute of genius compoſed out of the writings of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY a certain number of inſipid homilies, which they divided between themſelves and their ſtupid colleagues, that they

[b] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 428.

I might

might not be obliged through incapacity to diſcontinue preaching the doctrines of Chriſtianity to their people, as appears evident by the examples of CÆSARIUS biſhop of *Arles*, and ELOI biſhop of *Noyon* [*c*]. There is yet extant a ſummary of theological doctrine, which was unſkilfully compiled by TAION biſhop of *Saragoſſa*, from the writings of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY; and which was ſo highly exalted in this illiterate age, that its author was called, by the reſt of the biſhops, the *true ſalt of the earth*, and a divine light that was ſent to illuminate the world [*d*]. Many ſuch inſtances of the ignorance and barbarity of this century will occur to thoſe who have any acquaintance with the writers it produced. *England*, it is true, was happier in this reſpect than the other nations of *Europe*, which was principally owing to THEODORE of *Tarſus*, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak afterwards, who was appointed archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and contributed much to introduce, among the Engliſh, a certain taſte for literary purſuits, and to excite in that kingdom a zeal for the advancement of learning [*e*].

III. In *Greece*, the fate of the ſciences was truly lamentable. A turgid eloquence, and an affected pomp and ſplendor of ſtyle, which caſt a perplexing obſcurity over ſubjects in themſelves the moſt clear and perſpicuous, was now the higheſt point of perfection to which both proſe writers and poets aſpired. The Latin eloquence was ſtill vaſtly below that of the Greeks; it had not ſpirit enough

The ſciences and the art of writing ſunk into barbarity and corruption.

☞ [*c*] In the original we read ELIGIUS *Noviomagenſis*, which is a miſtake either of the author, or printer. It is probable that *Noviomagenſis* has ſlipt from the pen of Dr. MOSHEIM, in the place of *Noviodunenſis*; for ELOI was biſhop of *Noyon*, and not of *Nimeguen*.

[*d*] MABILLON, *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. i. p. 42.

[*e*] WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 42. CONRINGII *Antiquitat. Academicæ*, p. 277.

CENT. VII. PART II.

enough even to be turgid, and, a few compoſitions excepted, was ſunk to the very loweſt degree of barbarity and corruption. Both the Greek and Latin writers, who attempted hiſtorical compoſitions, degraded moſt miſerably that important ſcience. MOSCHUS and SOPHRONIUS among the former; and among the latter BRAULIO, JONAS an Hibernian, AUDOENUS, DADO, and ADAMANNUS, wrote the lives of ſeveral ſaints; or rather a heap of inſipid and ridiculous fables, void of the leaſt air of probability, and without the ſmalleſt tincture of eloquence. The Greeks related, without diſcernment or choice, the moſt vulgar reports that were handed about concerning the events of ancient times: and hence that multitude of abſurd fables, which the Latins afterwards copied from them with the utmoſt avidity.

The fate of philoſophy.

IV. Among the Latins philoſophy was at its loweſt ebb. If there were any that retained ſome faint reluctance to abandon it entirely, ſuch confined their ſtudies to the writings of BOETIUS and CASSIODORUS, from which they committed to memory a certain number of phraſes and ſentences; and that was all their philoſophical ſtock. The Greeks, abandoning PLATO to the monks, gave themſelves entirely up to the direction of ARISTOTLE, and ſtudied, with eagerneſs, the ſubtilties of his logic, which were of ſignal uſe in the controverſies carried on between the Monophyſites, the Neſtorians, and Monothelites. All theſe different ſects called the Stagirite to their aſſiſtance, when they were to plead their cauſe, and to defend their doctrines. Hence it was, that JAMES, biſhop of *Edeſſa*, who was a Monophyſite, tranſlated, in this century, the dialectics of ARISTOTLE into the Syriac language [*f*].

[*f*] See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 498.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government during this century.

I. THE diſputes about pre-eminence, that had ſo long ſubſiſted between the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, proceeded, in this century, to ſuch violent lengths, as laid the foundations of that deplorable ſchiſm, which afterwards ſeparated the Greek and Latin churches. The moſt learned writers, and thoſe who are moſt remarkable for their knowledge of antiquity, are generally agreed that, BONIFACE III. engaged PHOCAS, that abominable tyrant, who waded to the imperial throne through the blood of the emperor MAURITIUS, to take from the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* the title of *œcumenical*, or *univerſal biſhop*, and to confer it upon the Roman pontif. They relate this, however, upon the ſole authority of BARONIUS; for none of the ancient writers have mentioned it. If, indeed, we are to give credit to ANASTASIUS and PAUL DEACON [g], ſomething like what we have now related was tranſacted by PHOCAS; for when the biſhops of *Conſtantinople* maintained that their church was not only equal in dignity and authority to that of *Rome*, but alſo the head of all the Chriſtian churches, this tyrant oppoſed their pretenſions, and granted the pre-eminence to the church of *Rome*: and thus was the papal ſupremacy firſt introduced.

The diſputes about pre-eminence between the biſhops of Rome and Conſtantinople.

II. The Roman pontifs uſed all ſorts of methods to maintain and enlarge the authority and pre-eminence which they had acquired by a grant from the moſt odious tyrant that ever diſgraced

The ſupremacy of the former oppoſed by many.

[g] ANASTASIUS, *De vitis Pontificum*. PAUL. DIACON. *De rebus geſtis Longobard.* lib. iv. cap. xxxvii. *in* MURATORII *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. i. pars i. p. 46.

the

the annals of hiſtory. We find, however, in the moſt authentic accounts of the tranſactions of this century, that not only ſeveral emperors and princes, but alſo whole nations, oppoſed the ambitious views of the biſhops of *Rome*. The Byzantine hiſtory, and the *Formulary* of MARCULFUS, contain many proofs of the influence which the civil magiſtrate yet retained in religious matters, and of the ſubordination of the Roman pontifs to the regal authority. It is true, the Roman writers affirm, that CONSTANTINE POGONATUS abdicated the privilege of confirming, by his approbation, the election of the biſhop of that city; and, as a proof of this, they allege a paſſage of ANASTASIUS, in which it is ſaid, that, according to an edict of POGONATUS, *the pontif, who ſhould be elected, was to be ordained immediately, and without the leaſt delay* [*h*]. But every one muſt ſee, that this paſſage is inſufficient to prove what theſe writers aſſert with ſuch confidence. It is however certain, that this emperor abated, ſome ſay remitted, the ſum, which, ſince the time of THEODORIC, the biſhops of *Rome* had been obliged to pay to the imperial treaſury before they could be ordained, or have their election confirmed [*i*].

The ancient Britons and Scots perſiſted long in the maintenance of their religious liberty; and

[*h*] ANASTASII *vit. Pontif. in Bened.* p. 146. *in* MURATORII *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. iii.

[*i*] ANASTAS. *vit. Pontif. in Agathone*, p. 144. compared with MASCOVII *Hiſt. German.* tom. ii. p. 121. in the annotations. ☞ It will not be amiſs to obſerve here, that by the ſame edict, which diminiſhed the ordination money paid by the biſhops of *Rome* to the emperor, CONSTANTINE reſumed the power of confirming the election of the pope, which his predeceſſors had inveſted in the exarchs of *Ravenna*; ſo that the biſhop elect was not to be ordained till his election was notified to the court of *Conſtantinople*, and the imperial decree confirming it was received by the electors at *Rome*. See ANASTASIUS, in his life of AGATHO.

neither

neither the threats nor promiſes of the legates of *Rome* could engage them to ſubmit to the decrees and authority of the ambitious pontif, as appears manifeſtly from the teſtimony of BEDE. The churches of *Gaul* and *Spain* attributed as much authority to the biſhop of *Rome*, as they thought ſuitable to their own dignity, and conſiſtent with their intereſts; nay, even in *Italy*, his ſupreme authority was obſtinately rejected, ſince the biſhop of *Ravenna*, and other prelates, refuſed an implicit ſubmiſſion to his orders [*k*]. Beſides all this, multitudes of private perſons expreſſed publicly, and without the leaſt heſitation, their abhorrence of the vices, and particularly of the lordly ambition, of the Roman pontifs; and it is highly probable, that the Valdenſes or Vaudois had already, in this century, retired into the vallies of *Piedmont*, that they might be more at their liberty to oppoſe the tyranny of thoſe imperious prelates [*l*].

Vices of the clergy.

III. The progreſs of vice among the ſubordinate rulers and miniſters of the church was, at this time, truly deplorable; neither biſhops, preſbyters, deacons, nor even the cloiſtered monks, were exempt from the general contagion, as appears from the unanimous confeſſion of all the writers of this century that are worthy of credit. In thoſe very places, that were conſecrated to the advancement of piety, and the ſervice of God, there was little elſe to be ſeen than ghoſtly ambition, inſatiable avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, and a ſupercilious contempt of the natural rights of the people, with many other vices ſtill more enormous. There reigned alſo in many places the moſt bitter diſſenſions between the biſhops and the monks. The former had employed

[*k*] See GEDDES, *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, tom. ii. p. 6.

[*l*] See ANTOINE LEGER's *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, livr. i. p. 15.

the

the greedy hands of the latter to augment the epiſcopal treaſure, and to draw contributions from all parts to ſupport them in their luxury, and the indulgence of their luſts. The monks perceiving this, and alſo unwilling to ſerve the biſhops in ſuch a diſhonourable character, fled for refuge to the emperors and princes, under whoſe civil juriſdiction they lived; and afterwards, for their further ſecurity, had recourſe to the protection of the Roman pontif [*m*]. This protection they readily obtained, and the imperious pontifs, always fond of exerting their authority, exempted, by degrees, the monaſtic orders from the juriſdiction of the biſhops. The monks, in return for this important ſervice, devoted themſelves wholly to advance the intereſts, and to maintain the dignity, of the biſhop of *Rome*. They made his cauſe their own, and repreſented him as a ſort of God to the ignorant multitude, over whom they had gained a prodigious aſcendant by the notion that generally prevailed of the ſanctity of the monaſtic order. It is, at the ſame time, to be obſerved, that this *immunity* of the monks was a fruitful ſource of licentiouſneſs and diſorder, and occaſioned the greateſt part of the vices with which they were afterwards ſo juſtly charged. Such, at leaſt, is the judgment of the beſt writers upon this ſubject [*n*].

The ſtate of the monks.

IV. In the mean time the monks were every where in high repute, and their cauſe was accompanied with the moſt ſurpriſing ſucceſs, particularly among the Latins, through the protection

[*m*] See LAUNOII *Aſſertio inquiſitionis in Chartam Immunitatis S. Germani*, opp. tom. iii. pars I. p. 50. BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. ii. p. 159. tom. iv. p. 108. MURATORII *Antiq. Italic.* tom. ii. p. 944. 949.

[*n*] See LAUNOII *Examen privilegii S. Germani*, tom. iii. part I. p. 282. WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 43, 44. 49, &c.

and

and favour of the Roman pontif, and their phariſaical affectation of uncommon piety and devotion. The heads of families, ſtriving to ſurpaſs each other in their zeal for the propagation and advancement of monkery, dedicated their children to God, by ſhutting them up in convents, and devoting them to a ſolitary life, which they looked upon as the higheſt felicity [o]; nor did they fail to ſend with theſe innocent victims a rich dowry. Abandoned profligates, who had paſſed their days in the moſt enormous purſuits, and whoſe guilty conſciences filled them with terror and remorſe, were comforted with the deluſive hopes of obtaining pardon, and making atonement for their crimes, by leaving the greateſt part of their fortune to ſome monaſtic ſociety. Multitudes, impelled by the unnatural dictates of a gloomy ſuperſtition, deprived their children of fertile lands and rich patrimonies, in favour of the monks, by whoſe prayers they hoped to render the Deity propitious. Several eccleſiaſtics laid down rules for the direction of the monaſtic orders. Thoſe among the Latins, who undertook this pious taſk, were FRUCTUOSUS, ISIDORE, JOHANNES GERUNDINENSIS, and COLUMBA [p]. The rule of diſcipline, preſcribed by St. BENEDICT, was not as yet ſo univerſally followed as to exclude all others.

V. The writers of this age, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their genius or erudition, were very few in number. Among the Greeks, the firſt rank is due to MAXIMUS, a monk, who diſputed with great obſtinacy and warmth againſt the Monothelites, compoſed ſome illuſtrations upon the Holy Scriptures, and was, upon the whole, a man of no mean capacity, though unhappy through the impatience and violence of his natural temper. The Greek writers.

[o] GERVAIS, *Hiſtoire de l'Abbé Suger*, tom. i. p. 9—16.
[p] LUCÆ HOLSTENII *Codex Regular.* tom. ii. p. 225.

ISYCHIUS,

CENT. VII. PART II.

ISYCHIUS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, explained ſeveral books of ſcripture [q]; and left behind him ſeveral *Homilies*, and ſome productions of leſs importance.

DOROTHEUS, abbot of *Paleſtine*, acquired a conſiderable name by his *Aſcetic Diſſertations*, in which he laid down a plan of monaſtic life and manners.

ANTIOCHUS, a monk of SEBA in *Paleſtine*, and a monk of a very ſuperſtitious complexion, compoſed a *Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*, i. e. a ſummary or ſyſtem of the Chriſtian doctrine, which is by no means worthy of the higheſt commendation.

SOPHRONIUS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, was rendered illuſtrious, and attracted the veneration of ſucceeding ages, by the controverſies he carried on againſt thoſe who, at this time, were branded with the name of Heretics; and particularly againſt the Monothelites, of whoſe doctrine he was the firſt oppoſer, and alſo the fomenter of the diſpute which it occaſioned [r].

There are yet extant ſeveral *Homilies*, attributed to ANDREW biſhop of *Crete*, which are deſtitute of true piety and eloquence, and which are, moreover, conſidered by ſome writers as entirely ſpurious.

GREGORY, ſurnamed PISIDES, deacon of *Conſtantinople*, beſides the *Hiſtory of Heraclius and the Avares*, compoſed ſeveral poems, and other pieces of too little moment to deſerve mention.

THEODORE, abbot of *Raithu*, publiſhed a book which is ſtill extant, againſt thoſe ſects who ſeemed to introduce corrupt innovations into the Chriſt-

[q] See SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 261.

[r] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Martii ad* d. xi. p. 65.

ian

ian religion by their doctrine relating to the perſon of CHRIST.

VI. Among the Latin writers, a certain number were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt by their ſuperior abilities. ILDEFONSE, archbiſhop of *Toledo*, was reputed for his learning; the Spaniards, however, attribute to him, without foundation, certain treatiſes concerning the Virgin *Mary* [*s*]. The Latin writers.

We have yet extant *Two books of epiſtles*, written by DESIDERIUS, biſhop of *Cahors*, and publiſhed by the learned CANISIUS.

ELIGIUS, or ELOI, biſhop of *Limoges*, left behind him ſeveral *Homilies*, and ſome other productions.

MARCULF, a Gallic monk, compoſed *Two books of eccleſiaſtical forms*, which are highly valuable, as they are extremely proper to give us a juſt idea of the deplorable ſtate of religion and learning in this century [*t*].

ALDHELM, an Engliſh prelate, compoſed ſeveral poems *Concerning the Chriſtian life*, which exhibit but indifferent marks of genius and fancy [*u*].

JULIAN POMERIUS confuted the Jews, and acquired a name by ſeveral other productions, which are neither worthy of much applauſe nor of utter contempt. To all theſe we might add CRESCONIUS, whoſe *Abridgment of the canons* is well known; FREDEGARIUS the hiſtorian, and a few others.

[*s*] See the *Acta Sanctorum, Januar.* tom. ii. p. 535.

[*t*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 565.

☞ [*u*] This prelate certainly deſerved a more honourable mention than is here made of him by Dr. MOSHEIM. His poetical talents were by no means the moſt diſtinguiſhing part of his character. He was profoundly verſed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared alſo with dignity in the *paſchal* controverſy, that ſo long divided the Saxon and Britiſh churches. See COLLIER'S *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſt.* vol. i. p. 121.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church during this century.

CENT. VII. PART II.

The deplorable ſtate of religion.

I. IN this barbarous age, religion lay expiring under a motley and enormous heap of ſuperſtitious inventions, and had neither the courage nor the force to raiſe her head, or to diſplay her native charms, to a darkened and deluded world. In the earlier periods of the church, the worſhip of Chriſtians was confined to the one Supreme God, and his Son JESUS CHRIST: but the Chriſtians of this century multiplied the objects of their devotion, and paid homage to the remains of the true croſs, to the images of the ſaints and to bones, whoſe real owners were extremely dubious [*w*]. The primitive Chriſtians, in order to excite men to a courſe of piety and virtue, ſet before them that heavenly ſtate, and thoſe manſions of miſery, which the goſpel has revealed as the different portions of the right-

[*w*] It will not be amiſs to quote here a remarkable paſſage out of *The Life of St.* ELIGIUS, or ELOI, biſhop of *Noyon*, which is to be found in DACHERIUS's *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 92. This paſſage, which is very proper to give us a juſt idea of the piety of this age, is as follows: "Huic ſanctiſſimo viro inter cetera virtutum ſuarum miracula "id etiam a Domino conceſſum erat, ut ſanctorum martyrum "corpora, quæ per tot ſæcula abdita populis hactenus habe-"bantur, eo inveſtigante ac nimio ardore fidei indagante, "patefacta proderentur." It appears, by this paſſage, that St. ELOI was a zealous relic-hunter, and if we may give credit to the writer of his life, he was very ſucceſsful at this kind of game; for he ſmelt and unkennelled the carcaſſes of St. QUINTIN, St. PLATO, St. CRISPIN, St. CRISPINIAN, St. LUCIAN, and many more. The biſhops of this age, who were either ambitiouſly deſirous of popular applauſe, or intent upon accumulating riches, and filling their coffers with the oblations of a ſuperſtitious people, pretended to be endowed with a miraculous ſagacity in diſcovering the bodies of ſaints and martyrs.

eous and the wicked: while the Chriſtians of this century talked of nothing elſe but a certain fire, which effaced the ſtains of vice, and purified ſouls from their corruption. The *former* taught that CHRIST, by his ſufferings and death, had made atonement for the ſins of mortals; the *latter* ſeemed, by their ſuperſtitious doctrine, to exclude from the kingdom of heaven, ſuch as had not contributed, by their offerings, to augment the riches of the clergy, or the church [x]. The *former* were only ſtudious to attain to a virtuous ſimplicity of life and manners, and employed their principal zeal and diligence in the culture of true and genuine piety; while the *latter* placed the whole of religion in external rites and bodily exerciſes. The methods alſo of ſolving the difficulties, and diſſipating the doubts, that often aroſe in inquiſitive minds, were of a piece with the reſt of the ſuperſtitious ſyſtem that now prevailed. The two great and irreſiſtible argu-

[x] St. ELIGIUS, or ELOI, expreſſes himſelf upon this matter in the following manner: "Bonus Chriſtianus eſt, qui "ad eccleſiam frequenter venit, *et oblationem*, quæ in altari "Deo offeratur, exhibet; qui de fructibus ſuis non guſtat, "niſi prius Deo aliquid offerat; qui, quoties ſanctæ ſolem-"nitates adveniunt, ante dies plures caſtitatem etiam cum "propria uxore cuſtodit, ut ſecura conſcientia Domini altare "accedere poſſit; qui poſtremo ſymbolum vel orationem Do-"minicam memoriter tenet.—Redimite animas veſtras de "pœna, dum habetis in poteſtate remedia—oblationes et de-"cimas eccleſiis offerte, luminaria ſanctis locis, juxta quod "habetis, exhibite—ad eccleſiam quoque frequentius conve-"nite, ſanctorum patrocinia humiliter expetite—quod ſi ob-"ſervaveritis, ſecuri in die judicii ante tribunal æterni judi-"cis venientes dicetis: Da, Domine, quia dedimus:" ☞ We ſee here a large and ample deſcription of the character of a *good Chriſtian*, in which there is not the leaſt mention of the *love of God*, *reſignation* to his will, *obedience* to his laws, or of *juſtice*, *benevolence*, and *charity* towards men; and in which the whole of religion is made to conſiſt in *coming often to the church*, *bringing offerings to the altar*, *lighting candles* in conſecrated places, and ſuch like vain ſervices.

CENT. VII. PART II.

ments againſt all doubts, were *the authority of the church*, and the *working of miracles*: and the production of theſe prodigies required no extraordinary degree of dexterity in an age of ſuch groſs and univerſal ignorance.

The expoſitors of the Holy Scriptures.

II. Few either of the Greeks or Latins applied themſelves to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures during this century. There are yet extant ſome commentaries of ISYCHIUS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, upon certain books of *the Old Teſtament*, and upon *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*. MAXIMUS publiſhed a ſolution of LXV *queſtions relating to the Holy Scriptures*, and other productions of the ſame nature. JULIAN POMERIUS attempted, but without ſucceſs, to reconcile the ſeeming contradictions that are to be found in the ſacred writings, and to explain the prophecy of NAHUM. All theſe writers were manifeſtly inferior to the meaneſt expoſitors of modern times. The Grecian doctors, particularly thoſe who pretended to be initiated in the moſt myſterious depths of theology, were continually hunting after fantaſtic allegories, as is evident from the *Queſtions of* MAXIMUS already mentioned. The Latins, on the contrary, were ſo diffident of their abilities, that they did not dare to enter theſe allegorical labyrinths, but contented themſelves with what flowers they could pluck out of the rich collections of GREGORY and AUGUSTIN. Of this we ſee a manifeſt example in PATERIUS's *Expoſition of the Old and New Teſtament*, which is entirely compiled from the writings of GREGORY the GREAT [*y*]. Among the interpreters of this century, we muſt not forget THOMAS biſhop of *Heraclea*, who gave a

[*y*] This uſeleſs production has been uſually publiſhed with the works of GREGORY the GREAT: in conſequence of which, the Benedictine monks have inſerted it in their ſplendid edition of the works of that pontif, tom. iv. part II.

ſecond

ſecond Syriac verſion of all the books of the New Teſtament [z].

Didactic theology.

III. While philoſophy and theology had ſcarcely any remains of life, any marks of exiſtence among the Latins, the Greeks were wholly occupied with controverſies about certain particular branches of religion, and never once thought of reducing all the doctrines of chriſtianity into one regular and rational ſyſtem. It is true, ANTIOCHUS, a monk of *Paleſtine*, compoſed a ſhort ſummary of the Chriſtian doctrine, which he intitled, *The Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*. It is, however, eaſy to perceive what ſort of an author he was, how void of dignity and true judgment, from many circumſtances, and particularly from that rueful poem which is ſubjoined to his work; in which he deplores, in lamentable ſtrains, the loſs of that precious fragment of the true croſs, which is ſaid to have been carried away, by the Perſians, among other ſpoils. The moſt elegant and judicious ſummary of theology that appeared among the Latins in this century, was the Treatiſe of ILDEFONSE *De cognitione baptiſmi*, which was ſaved, by BALUSIUS, from the ruins of time; a work, indeed, which is not extremely neceſſary ſince the ignoble frauds of ſuperſtition have been ſo fully brought to light, though it contains remarkable proofs, that many of the corrupt additions and inventions, which diſfigure Chriſtianity in the popiſh churches, were not contrived till after this period [a]. The dry and inſipid body of

[z] Jos. SIM. ASSEMANNI, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 93, 94.

[a] See BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. vi. p. 1. From the work of ILDEFONSUS it appears evident, that the monſtrous doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* was abſolutely unknown to the Latins in this century; ſee C. 137. p. 99: that the Holy Scriptures were in the hands of all Chriſtians, and were peruſed

CENT. VII. PART II.

of divinity, compoſed by TAIO, or TAGO, biſhop of *Saragoſſa*, under the title of *Five Books of Sentences*, and compiled from the writings of GREGORY and AUGUSTIN, is ſcarcely worthy of mention, though, in this century, it was conſidered as an admirable and immortal work [*b*].

Several particular branches of doctrine were treated by the theological writers of this age: Thus MAXIMUS wrote concerning the nature of *Theology*, and the *Manifeſtation of the Son in the fleſh*, and alſo concerning the *Two natures in* CHRIST; and THEODORE RAITHU compoſed a treatiſe concerning CHRIST's *Incarnation*. But a ſmall acquaintance with the ſtate of learning and religion at this period, will enable us to form a juſt though diſadvantageous idea of the merit of theſe performances, and alſo of their authors.

Moral writers.

IV. The moral writers of this century, and their miſerable productions, ſhew too plainly to what a wretched ſtate that noble and important ſcience was now reduced. Among theſe moraliſts, the firſt rank is due to DOROTHEUS, author of the *Aſcetic Diſſertations*; MAXIMUS; ALDHELM; HESYCHIUS; THALASSIUS; and ſome others: yet even in their productions, what groveling notions do we find! what rubbiſh, what an heap of ſuperſtitious fancies, and how many marks of extravagance, perplexity, and doubt! Beſides; the *laity* had little reaſon to complain of the ſeverity of their moral directors, whoſe cuſtom it was to reduce all the obligations

uſed by them without the leaſt moleſtation or reſtraint, C. 80. p. 59. ILDEFONSUS, it is true, is zealous in baniſhing reaſon and philoſophy from religious matters; he however eſtabliſhes the *Holy Scriptures* and the *Writings of the ancient doctors* as the ſupreme tribunals before which all theological opinions are to be tried, p. 14. 22.

[*b*] See MABILLON, *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 68.

of

of Chriſtianity to the practice of a ſmall number of virtues, as appears from ALDHELM's *Treatiſe concerning the eight principal Virtues.* Nor was the neglect of theſe duties attended with ſuch penalties as were proper to reſtrain offenders. The falſe notions alſo, which prevailed in this age, tended much to diminiſh a juſt ſenſe of the nature and obligation of virtue; for the ſolitude of the monaſtic life, though accompanied with no marks of ſolid and genuine piety, was deemed ſufficient to atone for all ſorts of crimes, and was therefore honoured among the Latins with the title of the *ſecond baptiſm*, which circumſtance alone may ſerve to ſhew us the miſerable ſtate of Chriſtianity at this time. The greateſt part of the Grecian and Oriental monks laboured to arrive at a ſtate of perfection by mere contemplation, and ſtudiouſly endeavoured to form their temper and characters after the model of DIONYSIUS, the chief of the Myſtics.

The renewal of penitential diſcipline.

V. THEODORE of *Tarſus*, a Grecian monk, reſtored among the Latins the diſcipline of *penance*, as it is commonly termed, which had been for a long time almoſt totally neglected, and enforced it by a body of ſevere laws borrowed from the Grecian canons. This zealous prelate, being raiſed beyond his expectation to the ſee of *Canterbury* A. D. 668, formed and executed ſeveral pious and laudable projects; and among other things reduced to a regular ſcience that branch of eccleſiaſtical law, which is known by the name of *penitential diſcipline.* He publiſhed a *Penitential*, which was entirely new to the Latin world, by which the clergy were taught to diſtinguiſh ſins into various claſſes, according as they were more or leſs heinous, private or public; to judge of them and determine the degrees of their guilt by their nature and conſequences; the intention of the offender; the time and place in which they were

CENT. VII. PART II.

were committed; and the circumſtances with which they were attended. This new *Penitential* contained alſo the methods of proceeding with reſpect to offenders; pointed out the penalties that were ſuitable to the various claſſes of tranſgreſſions; preſcribed the forms of *conſolation*, *exhortation*, and *abſolution*; and deſcribed, in an ample and accurate manner, the duties and obligations of thoſe who were to receive the confeſſions of the penitent [*c*]. This new diſcipline, though of Grecian origin, was eagerly adopted by the Latin churches; and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, paſſed from *Britain* into all the weſtern provinces, where the book of THEODORE became the model of all other *penitentials*, and was multiplied in a vaſt number of copies. The duration of this diſcipline was but tranſitory; for, in the eighth century, it began to decline, and was, at length, entirely ſupplanted by what was called the new canon of *indulgences*.

The ſtate of Polemic theology.

VI. The doctors who oppoſed the various ſects are ſcarcely worthy of mention, and would deſerve ſtill leſs an attentive peruſal, did not their writings contribute to illuſtrate the hiſtory of the times in which they lived. NICIAS compoſed two books *againſt the Gentiles*; and PHOTIUS informs us, that a certain writer, whoſe name is unknown, embarked in the ſame controverſy, and ſupported the good cauſe by a prodigious number of arguments drawn from ancient records and monuments [*d*]. JULIAN POMERIUS exerted his polemic talent againſt the Jews. The views

[*c*] The *Penitential* of THEODORE is yet extant, though maimed and imperfect, in an edition publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1679, in 4to, by PETIT; and enriched with learned diſſertations and notes of the editor. We have alſo the cxx *Capitula Eccleſiaſt.* THEODORI, publiſhed in DACHERIUS's *Spicilegium*, tom. ix. and in the *Concilia* HARDUINI, tom. iii. p. 1771.

[*d*] *Biblioth. Cod.* clxx. p. 379.

of

of TIMOTHEUS were yet more extenſive; for he gave an ample deſcription and a laboured confutation of all the various *hereſies* that divided the church, in his book *Concerning the reception of Heretics.*

As to the diſſentions of the Catholic Chriſtians among themſelves, they produced, at this time, few or no events worthy of mention. We ſhall, therefore, only obſerve, that in this century were ſown the ſeeds of thoſe fatal diſcords, which rent aſunder the bonds of Chriſtian communion between the Greek and Latin churches; nay, theſe ſeeds had already taken root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman power became inſupportable, and the pretenſions of the ſovereign pontif odious.

In *Britain*, warm controverſies concerning baptiſm, the tonſure, and particularly the famous diſpute concerning the time of celebrating the Eaſter feſtival, were carried on between the ancient Britons, and the new converts to Chriſtianity, which AUGUSTIN had made among the Anglo-Saxons [*e*]. The fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity were not at all affected by theſe controverſies, which, on that account, were more innocent and leſs important than they would have

[*e*] CUMMANI *Epiſtola* in JAC. USSERII *Sylloge Epiſtolar. Hibernicar.* p. 23. BEDÆ *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſt. gentis Anglor.* lib. iii. cap. xxv. WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britann.* tom. i. p. 37. 42. *Acta Sanctor. Februar.* tom. iii. p. 21. 84. ☞ See alſo Dr. WARNER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, books II. and III. This hiſtory, which has lately appeared, deſerves the higheſt applauſe, on account of that noble ſpirit of liberty, candour, and moderation, that ſeems to have guided the pen of the judicious author. It were, at the ſame time, to be wiſhed, that this elegant hiſtorian had leſs avoided citing authorities, and been a little more laviſh of that erudition which he is known to poſſeſs: for then, after having ſurpaſſed COLLIER in all other reſpects, he would have equalled him in that depth and learning, which are the only meritorious circumſtances of his partial and diſagreeable hiſtory.

CENT. VII. PART II.

otherwiſe been. Beſides, they were entirely terminated, in the eighth century, in favour of the Anglo-Saxons, by the Benedictin monks [*f*].

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Religious rites multiplied.

I. IN the council of *Conſtantinople*, which was called *Quiniſextum* [*g*], the Greeks enacted ſeveral laws concerning the ceremonies that were to be obſerved in divine worſhip, which rendered their ritual, in ſome reſpects, different from that of the Romans. Theſe laws were publicly received by all the churches, which were eſtabliſhed in the dominions of the Grecian emperors; and alſo by thoſe which were joined with them in communion and doctrine, though under the civil juriſdiction of Barbarian princes. Nor was this all: for every Roman pontif added ſomething new to the antient rites and inſtitutions, as if it was an eſſential mark of their zeal for religion, and of their pious diſcharge of the miniſterial function, to divert the multitude with new ſhews and new ſpectacles of devout mummery. Theſe ſuperſtitious inventions were, in the time of CHARLEMAGNE, propagated from *Rome* among the other Latin churches, whoſe ſubjection to the Roman ritual was neceſſary to ſatisfy the ambitious demands of the lordly pontif.

[*f*] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iii. *Benedictinum*, p. 2. ☞ See alſo Dr. WARNER's *Eccleſiaſt. Hiſt.* book III.

☞ [*g*] This council was called *Quiniſextum*, from its being conſidered as a ſupplement to the fifth and ſixth councils of *Conſtantinople*, in which nothing had been decreed concerning the morals of Chriſtians, or religious ceremonies.

II. It

II. It will not be improper to ſelect here a few out of the many inſtances we could produce of the multiplication of religious rites in this century. The number of feſtivals, under which the church already groaned, was now augmented; a new feſtival was inſtituted in honour of the true croſs on which Chriſt ſuffered, and another in commemoration of the Saviour's aſcenſion into heaven. BONIFACE V. enacted that infamous law, by which the churches became places of refuge to all who fled thither for protection; a law which procured a ſort of impunity to the moſt enormous crimes, and gave a looſe rein to the licentiouſneſs of the moſt abandoned profligates. HONORIUS employed all his diligence and zeal in embelliſhing churches, and other conſecrated places, with the moſt pompous and magnificent ornaments; for as neither CHRIST, nor his apoſtles, had left any injunctions of this nature to their followers, their pretended vicar thought it but juſt to ſupply this defect by the moſt ſplendid diſplay of his oſtentatious beneficence. We ſhall paſs in ſilence the riches and variety of the ſacerdotal garments that were now uſed at the celebration of the euchariſt, and in the performance of divine worſhip, as this would lead us into a tedious detail of minute and unimportant matters.

Some examples of this addition to the ritual.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

I. THE Greeks were engaged, during this century, in the moſt bitter and virulent controverſy with the PAULICIANS, whom they conſidered as a branch of the Manichean ſect, and who

The remains of the ancient ſects.

CENT. VII. PART II.

who were ſettled in *Armenia* and the adjacent countries. This diſpute was carried to the greateſt height under the reigns of CONSTANS, CONSTANTINE POGONATUS, and JUSTINIAN II.; and the Greeks were not only armed with arguments, but were alſo ſeconded by the force of military legions, and the terror of penal laws. A certain perſon, whoſe name was CONSTANTINE, revived, under the reign of CONSTANS, the drooping faction of the PAULICIANS, which was now ready to expire; and propagated with great ſucceſs its peſtilential [*b*] doctrines. But this is not the place to enlarge upon the tenets and hiſtory of this ſect, whoſe origin is attributed to PAUL and JOHN, two brothers, who revived and modified the doctrine of MANES. As it was in the ninth century that the Paulicians flouriſhed moſt, and acquired ſtrength ſufficient to ſupport the rigours of an open and cruel war with the Greeks, we ſhall reſerve a more particular account of them for our hiſtory of that period.

Paulicians.

II. In *Italy*, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the Arians to the doctrine which was eſtabliſhed by the council of *Nice*. In *Gaul* and in *England*, the Pelagian and Semi-pelagian controverſies continued to excite the warmeſt animoſities and diſſenſions. In the eaſtern provinces, the ancient ſects, which had been weakened and oppreſſed by the imperial laws, but neither totally extirpated nor deſtroyed, began, in many places, to raiſe their heads, to recover their vigour, and to gain proſelytes. The terror of penal laws had obliged them, for ſome time, to ſeek their ſafety in their obſcurity, and therefore to conceal their opinions from the public eye; but

Arians.

Pelagians.

[*b*] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manich.* p. 61. PETRI SICULI *Hiſtoria Manich.* p. 41. GEORG. CEDRENUS, *Compend. Hiſt.* p. 431. edit. Venet.

as ſoon as they ſaw the fury or the power of their adverſaries diminiſh, their hopes returned, and their courage was renewed.

Neſtorians and Monophyſites.

III. The condition both of the Neſtorians and Monophyſites was much more flouriſhing under the Saracens, who were now become lords of the eaſt, than it had been hitherto under the Chriſtian emperors, or even the Perſian monarchs. Theſe two ſects met with a diſtinguiſhed protection from their new maſters, while the Greeks ſuffered under the ſame ſceptre all the rigours of perſecution and baniſhment. JESUIABAS, the ſovereign pontif of the Neſtorians, concluded a treaty firſt with MAHOMET, and afterwards with OMAR, by which he obtained many ſignal advantages for his ſect [*i*]. There is yet extant a *Teſtamentary Diploma* of MAHOMET, in which he promiſes and bequeaths to the Chriſtians, in his dominions, the quiet and undiſturbed enjoyment of their religion, together with their temporal advantages and poſſeſſions. Some learned men have, indeed, called in queſtion the authenticity of this deed; it is however certain, that the Mahometans unanimouſly acknowledge it to be genuine [*k*]. Accordingly, the ſucceſſors of MAHOMET in *Perſia* employed the Neſtorians in the moſt important affairs,

[*i*] Jos. SIMON. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part II. p. 94.

[*k*] This famous *Teſtament* of MAHOMET was brought from the eaſt, during the laſt century, by PACIFICUS SCALIGER, a Capuchin monk, and was publiſhed firſt in *Arabic* and *Latin* at *Paris* by GABRIEL SIONITA, A. D. 1630; afterwards in Latin by the learned FABRICIUS, A. D. 1638; and alſo by HINCKELMAN, A. D. 1690. See HENR. HOTTINGER. *Hiſt. Orient.* lib. ii. cap. xx. p. 237. ASSEMANNI *Bibl. Orient. Vat.* tom. iii. part II. p. 95. RENAUDOT, *Hiſtor. Patriarchar. Alexandr.* p. 168. They who, in conformity with the opinion of GROTIUS, reject this Teſtament, ſuppoſe it forged by the Syrian and Arabian monks, with a view to ſoften the Mahometan yoke under which they groaned, and to render their deſpotic maſters leſs ſevere. Nor is this repreſentation of the matter at all incredible; for it is certain, that the monks of

CENT. VII. PART II.

affairs, both of the cabinet and of the provinces, and ſuffered the patriarch of that ſect only, to reſide in the kingdom of *Babylon* [*l*]. The Monophyſites enjoyed in *Syria* and *Egypt* an equal degree of favour and protection. AMRUS, having made himſelf maſter of *Alexandria* in the year 644, fixed BENJAMIN, the pontif of the Monophyſites, in the epiſcopal reſidence of that noble city; and from this period, the Melchites [*m*] were without a biſhop for almoſt a whole century [*n*].

of mount *Sinai* formerly ſhewed an edict of MAHOMET of the ſame nature with the one now under conſideration, which they pretend was drawn up by him while he was yet in a private ſtation. This edict was extremely advantageous to them, and was, undoubtedly, an artful piece of forgery. The fraud was plain: but the Mahometans, in conſequence of their ignorance and ſtupidity, believed it to be a genuine production of their chief, and continue ſtill in the ſame opinion. There is an account of this fraud given by CANTIMER, in his *Hiſtoire de l' Empire Ottoman*, tom. ii. p. 269. The argument therefore which RENAUDOT and others draw in favour of the *Teſtament* in queſtion, from the acknowledgment which the Mahometans make of its authenticity, is of little or no weight; ſince the Mahometans of all others are the moſt liable to be deceived in things of this nature, by their groſs and unparalleled ignorance. On the other hand, ſeveral of the arguments uſed by thoſe, who deny the authenticity of this *Teſtament*, are equally unſatisfactory; that, particularly, which is drawn from the difference that there is between the ſtyle of this deed and that of the *Alcoran*, proves abſolutely nothing at all: ſince it is not eſſential to the genuineneſs of this Teſtament to ſuppoſe it penned by MAHOMET himſelf, becauſe the impoſtor might have employed a ſecretary to compoſe it. But let this *Teſtament* be genuine or ſpurious, it is undeniably certain that its contents were true; ſince many learned men have fully proved, that MAHOMET, at his firſt ſetting out, prohibited, in the ſtrongeſt manner, the commiſſion of all ſorts of injuries againſt the Chriſtians, and eſpecially the Neſtorians.

[*l*] ASSEMANNI, l. c. p. 97. EUSEBE RENAUD. *Hiſtor. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 163. 169.

☞ [*m*] The *Melchites* were thoſe Chriſtians in *Syria*, *Egypt*, and the *Levant*, who, though not Greeks, followed the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church. They were called Melchites, *i. e.* Royaliſts, by their adverſaries, by way of reproach, on account of their implicit ſubmiſſion to the edict of the emperor MARCIAN, in favour of the council of *Chalcedon*.

[*n*] EUSEB. RENAUD. *Hiſt. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 168.

Monotheliſes.

IV. Though the Greek church was already torn aſunder by the moſt lamentable diviſions, yet its calamities were far from being at an end. A new ſect aroſe, A. D. 630, under the reign of the emperor HERACLIUS, which, in a ſhort ſpace of time, excited ſuch violent commotions as engaged the eaſtern and weſtern churches to unite their forces in order to its extinction. The ſource of this tumult was an unſeaſonable plan of peace and union. HERACLIUS, conſidering, with pain, the detriment which the Grecian empire had ſuffered by the migration of the perſecuted Neſtorians, and their ſettlement in *Perſia*, was ardently deſirous of re-uniting the Monophyſites to the boſom of the Greek church, leſt the empire ſhould receive a new wound by their departure from it. Purſuant to this idea, he held a conference during the Perſian war, A. D. 622, with a certain perſon named PAUL, a man of great credit and authority among the Armenian Monophyſites; and another, at *Hierapolis*, in the year 629, with ATHANASIUS, the Catholic or biſhop of that ſect, upon the methods that ſeemed moſt proper to reſtore tranquillity and concord to a divided church. Both theſe perſons aſſured the emperor, that they who maintained the doctrine of *one nature*, might be induced to receive the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon*, and thereby to terminate their controverſy with the Greeks, provided that the latter would give their aſſent to the truth of the following propoſition, *viz. that in* JESUS CHRIST *there was, after the union of the two natures, but one will, and one operation.* HERACLIUS communicated this matter to SERGIUS, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who was a Syrian by birth, and whoſe parents adhered to the doctrine of the Monophyſites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that the doctrine of *one will* and *one operation*, after the *union* of the

two

CENT. VII. PART II.

two natures, might be ſafely adopted without the leaſt injury to truth, or the ſmalleſt detriment to the authority of the council of *Chalcedon*. In conſequence of this, the emperor publiſhed an edict, A. D. 630, in favour of that doctrine, and hoped, by this act of authority, to reſtore peace and concord both in church and ſtate [*o*].

The progreſs of their doctrine.

V. The firſt reception of this new project was promiſing, and things ſeemed to go on ſmoothly. For though ſome eccleſiaſtics refuſed ſubmitting to the imperial edict, yet CYRUS and ATHANASIUS, the patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, received it without heſitation; and the ſee of *Jeruſalem* was at that time vacant [*p*]. As to the Roman pontif, he was entirely overlooked in the matter, as his conſent was not conſidered as at all neceſſary in an affair that related only to the eaſtern church. In the mean time, CYRUS, who had been promoted by HERACLIUS from the ſee of *Phaſis* to that of *Alexandria*, aſſembled a council, by the ſeventh decree of which, the doctrine of Monotheliti ſm, or *one will*, which the emperor had introduced by the edict already mentioned, was ſolemnly confirmed. This new modification of the doctrine of the council of *Chalcedon*, which ſeemed to bring it nearer to the Eutychian ſyſtem, had the deſired effect upon the Monotheliites, and induced great numbers of them, who were diſperſed in *Egypt*, *Armenia*, and other remote provinces, to return into the boſom of the church. They, however, explained the perplexed and ambiguous doctrine of *one will* in

[*o*] The authors, who have written concerning this ſect, are mentioned by Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Græc.* vol. x. p. 204. The account which I have here given of them is drawn from the fountain head, and is ſupported by the beſt authorities.

[*p*] See LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 264.

CHRIST,

CHRIST, in a manner peculiar to themſelves, and not quite conformable to the true principles of their ſect.

The oppoſition it met with.

VI. This ſmiling proſpect of peace and concord was, however, but tranſitory, and was unhappily ſucceeded by the moſt dreadful tumults excited by a monk of *Paleſtine*, whoſe name was SOPHRONIUS. This monk, being preſent at the council aſſembled at *Alexandria* by CYRUS, in the year 633, had violently oppoſed the decree, which confirmed the doctrine of *one will* in CHRIST. His oppoſition, which was then treated with contempt, became more formidable the following year; when, raiſed to the patriarchal ſee of *Jeruſalem*, he ſummoned a council, in which the Monothelites were condemned as heretics, who revived and propagated the Eutychian errors concerning the mixture and confuſion of the two natures in CHRIST. Multitudes, alarmed at the cry of hereſy raiſed by this ſeditious monk, adopted his ſentiments; but it was HONORIUS, the Roman pontif, that he laboured principally to gain over to his ſide. His efforts, however, were vain: for SERGIUS, the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, having informed HONORIUS, by a long and artful letter, of the true ſtate of the queſtion, determined that pontif in favour of the doctrine, which maintained *one will* and *one operation* in CHRIST [*q*]. Hence aroſe thoſe obſtinate conteſts,

[*q*] The Roman Catholic writers have employed all their art and induſtry to repreſent the conduct of HONORIUS in ſuch a manner, as to ſave his pretended infallibility from the charge of error in a queſtion of ſuch importance. (See, among others, HARDUIN, *De ſacramento altaris*, which is publiſhed in his *Opera Selecta*, p. 255.) And, indeed, it is eaſy to find both matter of accuſation and defence in the caſe of this pontif. On the one hand, it would appear that he himſelf knew not his own ſentiments, nor attached any preciſe and definite meaning to the expreſſions he uſed in the courſe of this controverſy. On

tests, which rent the church into two sects, and the state into two factions.

The contests occasioned by the *Ecthesis* and the *Type*.

VII. In order to put an end to these commotions, HERACLIUS issued out, in the year 639, the famous edict composed by SERGIUS, and called the *Ecthesis*, or exposition of the faith, in which all controversies upon the question, *whether in* CHRIST *there was one, or two operations*, were strictly prohibited, though in the same edict the doctrine of *one will* was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the eastern bishops declared their assent to this new law, which was also submissively received by their chief PYRRHUS, who, upon the death of SERGIUS in the year 639, was raised to the see of *Constantinople*. In the west, the case was quite different. JOHN, the fourth Roman pontif of that name, assembled a council at *Rome* A. D. 639, in which the *Ecthesis* was rejected, and the Monothelites condemned. Nor was this all: for in the progress of this contest, a new edict, known by the name of *Type* or *Formulary*, was published, in the year 648, by the emperor CONSTANS, by the advice of PAUL of *Constantinople* [r], by which the *Ecthesis* was suppressed, and the contending parties commanded to terminate their disputes concerning the

On the other hand, it is certain, that he gave it as his opinion, that in CHRIST there was but *one will* and *one operation*. It was for this that he was condemned in the council of *Constantinople*, and he must of consequence be undoubtedly a heretic, if it is true, that general councils cannot err. See BOSSUET, in his *Defence of the Declaration made by the Gallican Clergy in the year* 1682, *concerning Ecclesiastical power*, pars II. lib. xii. cap. xxi. p. 182. See also BASNAGE, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 391.

☞ [r] It is proper to observe here, that PAUL, who was a Monothelite in his heart, and had maintained the Ecthesis with great zeal, fell upon this prudent measure with a view to appease the Roman pontif and the African bishops, who were incensed against him to the highest degree on account of his attachment to the doctrine of *one will*.

one

one will, and the *one operation* in CHRIST, by obſerving a profound ſilence upon that difficult and ambiguous ſubject. This ſilence, which was ſo wiſely commanded in a matter which it was impoſſible to determine to the ſatisfaction of the contending parties, appeared highly criminal to the angry and contentious monks. They, therefore, excited MARTIN, biſhop of *Rome*, to oppoſe his authority to an edict, which hindered them from propagating ſtrife and contention in the church; and their importunities had the deſired effect; for this prelate, in a council of an hundred and five biſhops, aſſembled at *Rome*, A. D. 649, condemned both the *Ecthеſis* and the *Type*, though without any mention of the names of the emperors who had publiſhed thoſe edicts, and thundered out the moſt dreadful anathemas againſt the Monothelites and their patrons, who were ſolemnly conſigned to the devil and his angels.

VIII. The emperor CONSTANS, juſtly irritated at theſe haughty and impudent proceedings of MARTIN, who treated the imperial laws with ſuch contempt, ordered him to be ſeized and carried into the iſle of *Naxos*, where he was kept priſoner a whole year. This order, which was followed with much cruel treatment, was executed by CALLIOPAS, exarch of *Italy*, in the year 650; and at the ſame time, MAXIMUS, the ringleader of the ſeditious monks, was baniſhed to *Bizyca*; and other rioters of the ſame tribe were differently puniſhed in proportion to the part they acted in this rebellion. Theſe reſolute proceedings rendered EUGENIUS and VITALIANUS, the ſucceeding biſhops of *Rome*, more moderate and prudent than their predeceſſor had been; eſpecially the latter, who received CONSTANS, upon his arrival at *Rome* in the year 663, with the higheſt marks of diſtinction and reſpect, and uſed the wiſeſt precautions to prevent the flame of that unhappy controverſy from

The ſixth general council.

CENT. VII. PART II.

from breaking out a ſecond time. And thus, for ſeveral years, it appeared to be extinguiſhed; but it was ſo only in appearance; it was a lurking flame, which ſpread itſelf ſecretly, and gave reaſon to thoſe who examined things with attention, to dread new combuſtions both in church and ſtate. To prevent theſe, CONSTANTINE POGONATUS, the ſon of CONSTANS, purſuant to the advice of AGATHO, the Roman pontif, ſummoned, in the year 680, the ſixth *general* or *œcumenical council*, in which he permitted the Monothelites and pope HONORIUS himſelf to be ſolemnly condemned in preſence of the Roman legates, who repreſented AGATHO in that aſſembly, and confirmed the ſentence pronounced by the council, by the ſanction of penal laws enacted againſt ſuch as pretended to oppoſe it.

A ſhort view of the doctrine of the Monothelites.

IX. It is difficult to give a clear and accurate account of the ſentiments of thoſe who were called Monothelites; nor is it eaſy to point out the objections of their adverſaries. Neither of the contending parties expreſs themſelves conſiſtently with what ſeem to have been their reſpective opinions; and they both diſavow the errors with which they reciprocally charge each other. The following obſervations contain the cleareſt notion we can form of the ſtate of this ſubtile controverſy. 1. The Monothelites declared that they had no connection with the Eutychians and Monophyſites; but maintained, in oppoſition to theſe two ſects, that in CHRIST there were two diſtinct natures, which were ſo united, though without the leaſt mixture or confuſion, as to form by their union only one perſon. 2. They acknowledged that the ſoul of CHRIST was endowed with a will or faculty of volition, which it ſtill retained after its union with the divine nature. For they taught that CHRIST was not only perfect God, but alſo perfect man: from whence it followed, that his ſoul

ſoul was endowed with the faculty of volition. 3. They denied that this faculty of volition in the ſoul of CHRIST, was abſolutely unactive, maintaining, on the contrary, that it co-operated with the divine will. 4. They, therefore, in effect, attributed to our Lord two wills, and theſe moreover operating and active. 5. They however affirmed, that, in a certain ſenſe, there was in CHRIST but one will and one manner of operation. CENT. VII. PART II.

X. We muſt not indeed imagine, that all, who were diſtinguiſhed by the title of Monothelites, were unanimous in their ſentiments with reſpect to the points now mentioned. Some, as appears from undoubted teſtimonies, meant no more than this, that the two wills in CHRIST were *one*, i. e. in perfect harmony; that the human will was in perpetual conformity with the divine, and was, conſequently, always holy, juſt, and good; in which opinion there is nothing reprehenſible. Others, approaching nearer to the ſentiments of the Monophyſites, imagined that the two wills or faculties of volition in CHRIST were blended into one, in that which they called the *perſonal union*: acknowledging, at the ſame time, that the diſtinction between theſe two wills was perceivable by reaſon, and that it was alſo neceſſary to diſtinguiſh carefully in this matter. The greateſt part of this ſect, and thoſe who were alſo the moſt remarkable for their ſubtilty and penetration, were of opinion, that the human will of CHRIST was the inſtrument of the divine; or, in other words, never operated or acted of itſelf, but was always ruled, influenced, and impelled by the divine will, in ſuch a manner, however, that when it was once ſet in motion, it decreed and operated with the ruling principle. The doctrine of one will and one operation in CHRIST, which the Different opinions among that ſect.

CENT. VII. PART II.

Monothelites maintained with ſuch invincible obſtinacy, was a natural conſequence of this hypotheſis; ſince the operation of an inſtrument and of the being who employs it, is one ſimple operation, and not two diſtinct operations or energies. According to this view of things, the Eutychian doctrine was quite out of the queſtion; and the only point of controverſy to be determined, was, whether the human will in CHRIST was a ſelf-moving faculty determined by its own internal impulſe; or whether, on the contrary, it derived all its motion and operations from the divine?

In the mean time, we may learn from this controverſy, that nothing is more precarious and nothing more dangerous and deceitful, than that religious peace and concord which are founded upon ambiguous doctrines, and cemented by obſcure and equivocal propoſitions, or articles of faith. The partiſans of the council of *Chalcedon* endeavoured to enſnare the Monophyſites, by propoſing their doctrine in a manner that admitted of a double explication; and by this imprudent piece of cunning, that ſhewed ſo little reverence for the truth, they involved both church and ſtate in tedious and lamentable diviſions.

Their fate after the council of *Conſtantinople*.

XI. The doctrine of the Monothelites, condemned and exploded by the council of *Conſtantinople*, found a place of refuge among the Mardaites, a people who inhabited the mounts *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, and who, about the concluſion of this century, were called Maronites, after Maro their firſt biſhop, a name which they ſtill retain. None of the ancient writers give any certain account of the firſt perſon who inſtructed theſe Mountaineers in the doctrine of the Monothelites; it is probable, however, from ſeveral circumſtances, that it was JOHN MARO, whoſe name

name they had adopted [*s*]. One thing, indeed, we know, with the utmoſt certainty, from the teſtimony of TYRIUS and other unexceptionable witneſſes, as alſo from the moſt authentic records, and that is, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the twelfth century, when abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of *one will* in CHRIST, they were re-admitted, in the year 1182, to the communion of the Roman church. The moſt learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their church againſt this accuſation; they have laboured to prove, by a variety of teſtimonies, that their anceſtors always perſevered in the Catholic faith, in their attachment to the Roman pontif, without ever adopting the doctrine either of the Monophyſites or Monothelites. But all their efforts are inſufficient to prove the truth of theſe aſſertions to ſuch as have any acquaintance with the hiſtory of the church and the records of ancient times; for to all ſuch the teſtimonies they allege will appear abſolutely fictitious and deſtitute of authority [*t*].

XII.

[*s*] This eccleſiaſtic received the name of MARO, from his having lived in the character of a monk in the famous convent of *St. Maro*, upon the borders of the *Orontes*, before his ſettlement among the Mardaites of mount *Libanus*. For an ample account of this prelate, ſee Jos. SIMON ASSEMANNI *Bibliothec. Orient. Clement. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 496.

[*t*] The cauſe of the Maronites has been pleaded by the writers of that nation, ſuch as ABRAHAM ECHELLENSIS, GABRIEL SIONITA, and others; but the moſt ample defence of their uninterrupted orthodoxy was made by FAUSTUS NAIRON, partly in his *Diſſertatio de origine, nomine, ac religione Marionitarum*, publiſhed at *Rome*, A. D. 1679, and partly in his *Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum et Chaldæorum Monumentis*, publiſhed in the ſame city A. D. 1624. None of the learned, however, were perſuaded by his arguments except PAGI* and LA ROCQUE, of whom the latter has given us, in his *Voyage de Syrie et de Montliban*, tom. ii. p. 28—128, a long

* See *Critica Baroniana ad A.* 694.

CENT. VII. PART II.

The council called *Quinisextum*.

XII. Neither the ſixth general council, in which the Monothelites were condemned, nor the fifth, which had been aſſembled in the preceding century, had determined any thing concerning eccleſiaſtical diſcipline or religious ceremonies. To ſupply this defect, a new aſſembly of biſhops was held purſuant to the order of JUSTINIAN II. in a ſpacious hall of the imperial palace called *Trullus*, i. e. *Cupola*, from the form of the building. This council, which met A. D. 692, was called *Quiniſextum*, as we had occaſion to obſerve formerly, from its being conſidered, by the Greeks, as a ſupplement to the fifth and ſixth œcumenical councils, and as having given to the acts of theſe aſſemblies the degree of perfection which they had hitherto wanted. There are yet extant an hundred and two laws, which were enacted in this council, and which related to the external celebration of divine worſhip, the government of the church, and the lives and manners of Chriſtians. Of theſe there are ſix, which are diametrically oppoſite to ſeveral opinions and rites of the Romiſh church; for which reaſon the Roman pontifs have refuſed to adopt, without reſtriction, the deciſions of this council, or to reckon it in the number of thoſe called *œcumenical*, though

diſſertation concerning the origin of the Maronites. Even the learned ASSEMANNUS, himſelf a Maronite, and who has ſpared no pains to defend his nation * againſt the reproach in queſtion, acknowledges ingenuouſly, that, among the arguments uſed by NAIRON and others in favour of the Maronites, there are a great many deſtitute of force. See Jo. MORINUS, *De Ordinat. Sacris*, p. 380. RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire Critique des Chretiens Orientaux*, chap. xiii. p. 146. EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Hiſtoria Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 149. and *Præf. ad Liturgias Orientales*. LE BRUN, *Explication de la Meſſe*, tom. ii. p. 626. *Pariſ.* 1726. The arguments of the contending parties are enumerated impartially, in ſuch a manner as leaves the deciſion to the reader, by LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 10.

* See *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 496.

they

they look upon the greateſt part of its decrees as worthy of applauſe [*u*].

[*u*] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. i. p. 486. CHRIST. LUPUS, *Diſſertat. de Concilio Trulliano, in Notis et Diſſertat. ad Concilia,* tom. iii. opp. p. 168. The Roman Catholics reject the following deciſions of this council: 1. The fifth *canon*, which approves of the eighty-five apoſtolical canons commonly attributed to CLEMENT. 2. The thirteenth *canon*, which allows the prieſts to marry. 3. The fifty-fifth *canon*, which condemns the ſabbath faſt, that was an inſtitution of the Latin church. 4. The ſixty-ſeventh *canon*, which preſcribes the moſt rigorous abſtinence from blood and things ſtrangled. 5. The eighty-ſecond *canon*, which prohibits the repreſenting CHRIST under the image of a lamb. 6. The thirty-ſixth *canon*, concerning the equal rank and authority of the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*.

AN

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BOOK THE THIRD.

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH,

FROM

CHARLEMAGNE

TO

THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.

THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the church during this century.

The goſpel propagated in *Hyrcania* and *Tartary*.

I. WHILE the Mahometans were infeſting with their arms, and adding to their conqueſts, the moſt flouriſhing provinces of *Aſia*, and obſcuring, as far as their influence could extend, the luſtre and glory of the riſing church, the Neſtorians of *Chaldea* were carrying the lamp of Chriſtianity among thoſe barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, who, independent on the Saracen yoke, had fixed their habitations within the limits of mount *Imaus* [*a*]. It is now well known,

☞ [*a*] The ſouthern regions of *Scythia* were divided by the ancients (to whom the northern were unknown) into three parts, namely, *Scythia within*, and *Scythia beyond Imaus*, and *Sarmatia*. It is of the firſt of theſe three that Dr. MOSHEIM ſpeaks as enlightened at this time with the knowledge of the goſpel; and it comprehended *Turkeſtan* and *Mongal*, the *Uſbek*, or *Zagata*, *Kalmuc* and *Nogaian Tartary*, which were peopled by the Bactrians, Sogdians, Gandari, Sacs, and Maſſagetes, not to mention the land of *Siberia*, *Samoiedes*, and *Nova Zembla*, which were uninhabited in ancient times.

that

CENT. VIII. PART I.

that TIMOTHEUS, the Neſtorian pontif, who had been raiſed to that dignity A. D. 778, converted to the Chriſtian faith, by the miniſtry of SUBCHAL JESU, whom he had conſecrated biſhop, firſt the Gelæ and Dailamites, by whom a part of *Hyrcania* was inhabited; and afterwards, by the labours of other miſſionaries, the reſt of the nations, who had formed ſettlements in *Hyrcania*, *Bactria*, *Margiana*, and *Sogdia* [*b*]. It is alſo certain, that Chriſtianity enjoyed in theſe vaſt regions, notwithſtanding the violent attacks of the Mahometans to which it was ſometimes expoſed, the advantages of a firm and ſolid eſtabliſhment for a long courſe of ages; while the biſhops, by whoſe miniſtry it was propagated, and ſupported, were all conſecrated by the ſole authority of the Neſtorian pontif.

The Germans converted by Boniface.

II. If we turn our eyes towards Europe, we find many nations that were as yet unenlightened with the knowledge of the goſpel. Almoſt all the Germans (if we except the Bavarians, who had embraced Chriſtianity under THEODORIC, or THIERRY, the ſon of CLOVIS, and the eaſtern Franks, with a few other provinces) lay buried in the groſſeſt darkneſs of Pagan ſuperſtition. Many attempts were made, by pious and holy men, to infuſe the truth into the minds of theſe ſavage Germans; and various efforts were uſed for the ſame purpoſe by kings and princes, whoſe intereſt it was to propagate a religion that was ſo adapted to mitigate and tame the ferocity of theſe warlike nations; but neither the attempts of pious zeal, nor the efforts of policy, were attended with ſucceſs. This great work was, however, effected in this century, by the miniſtry of WINFRID, a

[*b*] THOMAS MARGENSIS, *Hiſtoriæ Monaſticæ*, lib. iii. *in* JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Bibliotheca Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. pars I. p. 491. See alſo this latter work, tom. iii. pars II. cap. ix. § 5. p. 478.

Benedictine

Benedictine monk, born in *England* of illuſtrious parents, and afterwards known by the name of BONIFACE. This famous eccleſiaſtic, attended by two companions of his pious labours, paſſed over into *Frieſland*, A. D. 715, to preach the goſpel to the people of that country, but this firſt attempt was unſucceſsful; and a war breaking out between RADBOD, the king of that country, and CHARLES MARTEL, our zealous miſſionary returned to *England*. He reſumed, however, his pious undertaking in the year 719; and being ſolemnly impowered, by the Roman pontif GREGORY II. to preach the goſpel not only in *Frieſland*, but all over *Germany*, he performed the functions of a Chriſtian teacher among the Thuringians, Frieſlanders, and Heſſians, with conſiderable ſucceſs [c].

Other pious exploits of this famous miſſionary, and his advancement in the church.

III. This eminent miſſionary was, in the year 723, conſecrated biſhop by GREGORY II. who changed the name of WINFRID into that of BONIFACE; ſeconded alſo by the powerful protection, and encouraged by the liberality of CHARLES MARTEL, mayor of the palace to CHILPERIC king of *France*, he reſumed his miniſterial labours among the Heſſians and Thuringians, and finiſhed with glory the taſk he had undertaken, in which he received conſiderable aſſiſtance from a number of pious and learned men, who repaired to him from *England* and *France*. As the Chriſtian churches erected by BONIFACE were too numerous to be governed by one biſhop, this prelate was advanced to the dignity of archbiſhop, in the year 738, by GREGORY III. by whoſe authority, and the auſpicious protection of CARLOMAN and PEPIN,

[c] An ample account of this eminent man is to be found in a learned diſſertation of GUDENIUS, *De S. Bonifacio Germanorum Apoſtolo*, publiſhed in 4to at *Helmſtad* in the year 1722. See alſo Jo. AL. FABRICII *Biblioth. Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 709. *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 92. MABILLON, *in Annalibus Benedictinis*, &c.

the

CENT. VIII. PART I.

the ſons of CHARLES MARTEL, he founded, in *Germany*, the biſhoprics of *Wurtzbourg*, *Burabourg*, *Erfurt*, and *Aichſtadt*: to which he added, in the year 744, the famous monaſtery of *Fulda*. His laſt promotion, and the laſt recompence of his aſſiduous labours in the propagation of the truth, was his advancement to the archiepiſcopal ſee of *Mentz*, A. D. 746, by ZACHARY, biſhop of *Rome*, by whom he was, at the ſame time, created primate of *Germany* and *Belgium*. In his old age, he returned again to *Frieſland*, that he might finiſh his miniſtry in the ſame place where he had entered firſt upon its functions: but his piety was ill rewarded by that barbarous people, by whom he was murdered in the year 755, while fifty eccleſiaſtics, who accompanied him in this voyage, ſhared the ſame unhappy fate.

The judgment we are to form concerning the apoſtleſhip of Boniface.

IV. BONIFACE, on account of his miniſterial labours and holy exploits, was diſtinguiſhed by the honourable title of the *Apoſtle of the Germans*; nor, if we conſider impartially the eminent ſervices he rendered to Chriſtianity, will this title appear to have been undeſervedly beſtowed. But it is neceſſary to obſerve, that this eminent prelate was an apoſtle of modern faſhion, and had, in many reſpects, departed from the excellent model exhibited in the conduct and miniſtry of the primitive and true apoſtles. Beſides his zeal for the glory and authority of the Roman pontif, which equalled, if it did not ſurpaſs, his zeal for the ſervice of CHRIST, and the propagation of his religion [*d*], many other things unworthy of a

[*d*] The French Benedictine monks ingenuouſly confeſs that BONIFACE was an over-zealous partiſan of the Roman pontif, and attributed more authority to him than was juſt and fitting. Their words, in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 106. are as follows: "Il exprime ſon devouement pour le "S. Siege en des termes qui ne ſont pas aſſez proportionés à "la dignité du caractere epiſcopal."

truly

truly Chriſtian miniſter are laid to his charge. In combating the Pagan ſuperſtitions, he did not always uſe thoſe arms, with which the ancient heralds of the goſpel gained ſuch victories in behalf of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and ſometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Chriſtians. His *epiſtles*, moreover, diſcover an imperious and arrogant temper; a cunning and inſidious turn of mind; an exceſſive zeal for increaſing the honours and pretenſions of the ſacerdotal order; and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was abſolutely neceſſary in an apoſtle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Chriſtian religion.

Other apoſtles preach the goſpel to the Germans.

V. The famous prelate, of whom we have been now ſpeaking, was not the only Chriſtian miniſter, who attempted to deliver the *German* nations from the miſerable bondage of Pagan ſuperſtition; ſeveral others ſignalized their zeal in the ſame laudable and pious undertaking. CORBINIAN, a French Benedictine monk, after having laboured with vaſt aſſiduity and fervour in planting the goſpel among the Bavarians, and other countries, became biſhop of *Frieſingen* [e]. FIRMIN, a Gaul by birth, preached the goſpel under various kinds of ſuffering and oppoſition in *Alſatia*, *Bavaria*, and *Helvetia*, now *Switzerland*, and had inſpection over a conſiderable number of monaſteries [f]. LEBUIN, an Engliſhman, laboured with the moſt ardent zeal and aſſiduity to engage the fierce and warlike Saxons, and alſo the Frieſlanders, Belgæ, and other nations, to receive the light of Chriſtianity; but his miniſtry was attended with very

[e] BARONIUS, *Annal. Eccleſ.* tom. viii. *ad An.* DCCXVI. § 10. CAR. MAICHELBECK, *Hiſtoriæ Friſingenſis*, tom. i.

[f] HERM. BRUSCHII *Chronologia Monaſter. German.* p. 30. ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Annales Baronii*, tom. ii. *ad An.* DCCLIX. § 9. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 124.

little

CENT. VIII. PART I.

little fruit [g]. We pass over in silence several apostles of less fame; nor is it necessary to mention WILLIBRORD, and others of superior reputation, who persisted now with great alacrity and constancy in the labours they had undertaken, in the preceding century, in order to the propagation of divine truth.

The expedition of Charlemagne against the Saxons.

VI. A war broke out, at this time, between CHARLEMAGNE and the Saxons, which contributed much to the propagation of Christianity, though not by the force of a rational persuasion. The Saxons were, at this time, a numerous and formidable people, who inhabited a considerable part of *Germany*, and were engaged in perpetual quarrels with the Franks concerning their boundaries and other matters of complaint. Hence CHARLEMAGNE turned his arms against this powerful nation, A. D. 772, with a design, not only to subdue that spirit of revolt with which they had so often troubled the empire, but also to abolish their idolatrous worship, and engage them to embrace the Christian religion. He hoped, by their conversion, to vanquish their obstinacy, imagining that the divine precepts of the gospel would assuage their impetuous and restless passions, mitigate their ferocity, and induce them to submit more tamely to the government of the Franks. These projects were great in idea, but difficult in execution; accordingly, the first attempt to convert the Saxons, after having subdued them, was unsuccessful, because it was made, without the aid of violence or threats, by the bishops and monks, whom the victor had left among that conquered people, whose obstinate attachment to idolatry no arguments nor exhortations could overcome. More forcible means were afterwards used

[g] HUCBAIDI *Vita S.* LEBUINI *in* LAUR. SURII *Vitis Sanctor.* d. 12. Nov. p. 277. Jo. MOLLEII *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 464.

to draw them into the pale of the church, in the wars which CHARLEMAGNE carried on, in the years 775, 776, and 780, againſt that valiant people, whoſe love of liberty was exceſſive, and whoſe averſion to the reſtraints of ſacerdotal authority was inexpreſſible [*b*]. During theſe wars, their attachment to the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors was ſo warmly combated by the allurements of reward, by the terror of puniſhment, and by the imperious language of victory, that they ſuffered themſelves to be baptiſed, though with inward reluctance, by the miſſionaries, which the emperor ſent among them for that purpoſe [*i*]. Theſe ſedi-

[*b*] It will be proper here to tranſcribe, from the epiſtles of the famous ALCUIN, once abbot of *Canterbury*, a remarkable paſſage, which will ſhew us the reaſons which contributed principally to give the Saxons an averſion to Chriſtianity, and at the ſame time expoſe the abſurd and prepoſterous manner of teaching uſed by the miſſionaries, who were ſent to convert them. This paſſage, in the CIVth *epiſtle*, and the 1647th page of his works, is as follows: "Si tanta inſtantia leve "CHRISTI jugum et onus ejus leve duriſſimo Saxonum po-"pulo prædicaretur, quanta Decimarum redditi vel legalis "pro parviſſimis quibuſlibet culpis edictis neceſſitas exigeba-"tur, forte baptiſmatis ſacramenta non abhorrerent. Sint "tandem aliquando DOCTORES FIDEI APOSTOLICIS ERU-"DITI EXEMPLIS: ſint PRÆDICATORES NON PRÆDATO-"RES." Here the reader may ſee a lively picture of the kind of apoſtles that flouriſhed at this time; apoſtles who were more zealous in exacting *tithes*, and extending their authority, than in propagating the ſublime truths and precepts of the goſpel. And yet theſe very apoſtles are ſaid to have wrought ſtupendous miracles.

[*i*] ALCUINUS apud WILHELMUM MALMESBUR. *De geſtis regum Anglorum*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 23. inter *Rerum Anglicar. Scriptores*, *Francofurti*, A. D. 1601. editos. In this work we find the following paſſage, which proves what we have ſaid with reſpect to the unworthy methods that were uſed in converting the Saxons: "Antiqui Saxones et omnes Freſonum "populi, inſtante Rege CAROLO, alios PRÆMIIS et alios "MINIS ſollicitantes ad fidem CHRISTI converſi ſunt." See alſo two paſſages in the *Capitularia Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 246. and 252. From the firſt of theſe paſſages we learn, that thoſe of the Saxons who abandoned the Pagan ſuperſti-

CENT. VIII. PART I.

ſeditions, indeed, were ſoon after renewed, and fomented by WIDEKIND and ALBION, two of the moſt valiant among the Saxon chiefs, who attempted to aboliſh the Chriſtian worſhip by the ſame violent methods which had contributed to its eſtabliſhment. But the courage and liberality of CHARLEMAGNE, alternately employed to ſuppreſs this new rebellion, engaged theſe chiefs to make a public and ſolemn profeſſion of Chriſtianity in the year 785, and to promiſe an adherence to that divine religion for the reſt of their days [*k*]. To prevent, however, the Saxons from renouncing a religion which they had embraced with reluctance, ſeveral biſhops were appointed to reſide among them, ſchools alſo were erected, and monaſteries founded, that the means of inſtruction might not be wanting. The ſame precautions were employed among the Huns in *Pannonia*, to maintain in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity that fierce people, whom CHARLEMAGNE had convert-

tions, were "reſtored to the liberty they had forfeited by the "fate of arms, and freed from the obligation of paying tri-"bute;" and in the ſecond, we find the following ſevere law, that "every Saxon, who contemptuouſly refuſed to receive "the ſacrament of baptiſm, and perſiſted in his adherence to "Paganiſm, was to be puniſhed with death." While ſuch rewards and puniſhments were employed in the cauſe of religion, there was no occaſion for miracles to advance its progreſs, for theſe motives were ſufficient to draw all mankind to an hypocritical and external profeſſion of the goſpel; but it is eaſy to imagine what ſort of Chriſtians the Saxons muſt have been, who were dragooned into the church in this abominable manner. Compare with the authors mentioned in this note, LAUNOIUS, *De vetĕri more baptizandi Judæos et Infideles*, cap. v, vi. p. 703. tom. ii. opp. part II. This author aſſures us that ADRIAN, the firſt Roman pontif of that name, honoured with his approbation CHARLEMAGNE's method of converting the Saxons.

[*k*] EGINARTUS, *De vita Caroli M.* ADAM BREMENSIS, lib. i. cap. viii. See alſo the writers of the hiſtory and exploits of CHARLEMAGNE, which are mentioned by Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950.

ed

ed to the faith, when, exhauſted and dejected by various defeats, they were no longer able to make head againſt his victorious arms, and choſe rather to be Chriſtians than *ſlaves* [*l*].

The judgment we ought to form of the converſions made by Charlemagne.

VII. Succeeding generations, filled with a grateful ſenſe of the famous exploits which CHARLEMAGNE had performed in the ſervice of Chriſtianity, canonized his memory, and turned this bloody *warrior* into an eminent *ſaint*. In the twelfth century FREDERIC I. emperor of the Romans, ordered PASCHAL II. whom he had raiſed to the pontificate, to enrol the name of this mighty conqueror among the tutelary ſaints of the church [*m*]. And indeed CHARLEMAGNE merited this honour, according to the opinions which prevailed at that period of time; for to have enriched the clergy with large and magnificent donations [*n*], and to have extended the boundaries of the church, no matter by what methods, was then conſidered as the higheſt merit, and as a ſufficient pretenſion to the honour of *ſaintſhip*. But in the eſteem of thoſe, who judge of the nature and characters of *ſanctity* by the deciſions of the goſpel upon that head, the *ſainted* emperor will appear utterly unworthy of that ghoſtly dignity. For, not to enter into a particular detail of his vices, whoſe number counterbalanced that of his virtues, it is undeniably evident, that his ardent and ill-conducted zeal for the converſion of the Huns, Frieſlanders, and Saxons, was more animated by the ſuggeſtions of ambition, than by a principle

[*l*] *Vita S. Rudberti in* HENRIC. CONISII *Lectionibus antiquis*, tom. iii. part II. p. 340. PAULI DEBRECENI *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Reformat. in Hungar. et Tranſilvania a* LAMPIO *edita*, pars I. cap. ii. p. 10.

[*m*] Vid. HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. pars II. p. 207. WALCHII *Diſſert. de Caroli Magni Canonizatione.*

[*n*] Vid. CAROLI *Teſtamentum in* STEPH. BALUSII *Capitularibus Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 487.

of true piety; and that his main view in these religious exploits was to subdue the converted nations under his dominion, and to tame them to his yoke, which they supported with impatience, and shook off by frequent revolts. It is, moreover, well known, that this boasted saint made no scruple of seeking the alliance of the infidel Saracens, that he might be more effectually enabled to crush the Greeks, notwithstanding their profession of the Christian religion [o].

And of the miracles which are said to have been performed in this century.

VIII. The many and stupendous miracles, which are said to have been wrought by the Christian missionaries, who were sent to convert the barbarous nations, have lost, in our times, the credit they obtained in former ages. The corrupt discipline that then prevailed, admitted of those fallacious stratagems, which are very improperly called *pious* frauds; nor did the heralds of the gospel think it at all unlawful to terrify or allure to the profession of Christianity by fictitious prodigies, those obdurate hearts, which they could not subdue by reason and argument. It is not, however, to be supposed, that all those, who acquired renown by their miracles, were chargeable with this fanatical species of artifice and fraud. For as, on the one hand, those ignorant and superstitious nations were disposed to look upon, as miraculous, every event which had an unusual aspect; so, on the other, the Christian doctors themselves were so uninstructed and superficial, so little acquainted with the powers of nature, and the relations and connections of things in their ordinary course, that uncommon events, however natural, were considered by them as miraculous interpositions of the Most High. This will appear obvious to such as, void of superstition and

[o] See BASNAGE, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. ix. cap. ii. p. 40.

par-

partiality, read the *Acts of the ſaints* who flouriſhed in this and the following centuries.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

I. THE eaſtern empire had now fallen from its former ſtrength and grandeur, through the repeated ſhocks of dreadful revolutions, and the conſuming power of inteſtine calamities. The throne was now become the ſeat of terror, inquietude and ſuſpicion; nor was any reign attended with an uninterrupted tranquillity. In this century three emperors were dethroned, loaded with ignominy, and ſent into baniſhment. Under LEO the Iſaurian, and his ſon CONSTANTINE, ſurnamed COPRONYMUS, aroſe that fatal controverſy about the worſhip of images, which proved a ſource of innumerable calamities and troubles, and weakened, almoſt incredibly, the force of the empire. Theſe troubles and diſſentions left the Saracens at liberty to ravage the provinces of *Aſia* and *Africa*, to oppreſs the Greeks in the moſt barbarous manner, and to extend their territories and dominion on all ſides, as alſo to oppoſe every where the progreſs of Chriſtianity, and, in ſome places, to extirpate it entirely. But the troubles of the empire, and the calamities of the church, did not end here: for about the middle of this century, they were aſſailed by new enemies, ſtill more fierce and inhuman than thoſe whoſe uſurpations they had hitherto ſuffered. Theſe were the Turks, a tribe of the Tartars, or at leaſt their deſcendants, who, breaking forth from the inacceſſible wilds about mount *Caucaſus*, overſpread *Colchis*, *Iberia*, and *Albania*, ruſhed from thence into *Armenia*,

The Saracens become maſters in the eaſt.

The incurſion of the Turks.

CENT. VIII. PART I.

menia, and, after having ſubdued the Saracens, turned their victorious arms againſt the Greeks, whom, in proceſs of time, they reduced under their dominion.

Their progreſs in the weſt.

II. In the year 714, the Saracens croſſed the ſea, which ſeparates *Spain* from *Africa*, diſperſed the army of RODERIC king of the Spaniſh Goths [*p*], whoſe defeat was principally due to the treachery of their general JULIAN, and made themſelves maſters of the greateſt part of the territories of this vanquiſhed prince. About the ſame time the empire of the Viſigoths, which had ſubſiſted in *Spain* above three hundred years, was totally overturned by theſe fierce and ſavage invaders, who alſo took poſſeſſion of all the maritime coaſts of *Gaul*, from the Pyrenean mountains to the river *Rhone*, from whence they made frequent excurſions, and ravaged the neighbouring countries with fire and ſword.

The rapid progreſs of theſe bold invaders was, indeed, checked by CHARLES MARTEL, who gained a ſignal victory over them in a bloody action near the city of *Poitiers*, A. D. 732 [*q*]. But the vanquiſhed ſpoilers ſoon recovered their ſtrength and their ferocity, and returned with new violence to their devaſtations. This engaged CHARLEMAGNE to lead a formidable army into *Spain*, with a deſign to deliver that whole country from the oppreſſive yoke of the Saracens: but this grand enterprize, though it did not entirely miſcarry, was not, however, attended with the ſignal ſucceſs that was expected from it [*r*].

[*p*] Jo. MARIANA, *Rerum Hiſpanicarum*, lib. vi. cap. xxi. EUSEBE RENAUDOT. *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 253. Jo. DE FERRERAS, *Hiſt. d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 425.

[*q*] PAULUS DIACONUS, *De geſtis Longobard.* lib. vi. cap. xlvi. liii. Jo. MARIANA, *Rerum Hiſpan.* lib. vii. cap. iii. BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ABDERAMUS. FERRERAS, *Hiſt. d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 463.

[*r*] HENR. DE BUNAU, *Teutſche Keyſer-und Reich's Hiſtoire*, tom. ii. p. 392. FERRERAS, *Hiſt. d'Eſpagne*, tom ii. p. 506.

The

The inroads of this warlike people were felt by many of the weſtern provinces, beſides thoſe of *France* and *Spain*. Several parts of *Italy* ſuffered from their incurſions; the iſland of *Sardinia* was reduced under their yoke; and *Sicily* was ravaged and oppreſſed by them in the moſt inhuman manner. Hence the Chriſtian religion in *Spain* and *Sardinia* ſuffered inexpreſſibly under theſe violent uſurpers.

In *Germany*, and the adjacent countries, the Chriſtians were aſſailed by another ſort of enemies; for all ſuch as adhered to the Pagan ſuperſtitions beheld them with the moſt inveterate hatred, and perſecuted them with the moſt unrelenting violence and fury [*s*]. Hence, in ſeveral places, caſtles and fortreſſes were erected to reſtrain the incurſions of theſe Barbarian zealots.

[*s*] SERVATI LUPI *vita Wigberti*, p. 304.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

CENT. VIII. PART II.

The ſtate of learning among the Greeks.

I. THERE were not wanting among the Greeks men of genius and talents, who might have contributed to prevent the total decline of literature; but their zeal was damped by the tumults and deſolations that reigned in the empire; and while both church and ſtate were menaced with approaching ruin, the learned were left deſtitute of that protection which gives both vigour and ſucceſs to the culture of the arts and ſciences. Hence few or none of the Greeks were at all famous either for elegance of diction, true wit, copious erudition, or a zealous attachment to the ſtudy of philoſophy, and the inveſtigation of truth. Frigid homilies, inſipid narrations of the exploits of pretended ſaints, vain and ſubtile diſputes about uneſſential and trivial ſubjects, vehement and bombaſtic declamations for or againſt the erection and worſhip of images, hiſtories compoſed without method or judgment; ſuch were monuments of Grecian learning in this miſerable age.

...e pro-...ſs of the ...ſtotelian ...loſophy.

II. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that the Ariſtotelian philoſophy was taught every where in the public ſchools, and was propagated in all places with conſiderable ſucceſs. The doctrine of PLATO had loſt all its credit in the ſchools, after the repeated ſentences of condemnation that had

had been paſſed upon the opinions of ORIGEN, and the troubles which the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies had excited in the church; ſo that Platoniſm now was almoſt confined to the ſolitary retreats of the monaſtic orders. Of all the writers in this century, who contributed to the illuſtration and progreſs of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, the moſt eminent was JOHN DAMASCENUS, who compoſed a conciſe, plain, and comprehenſive view of the doctrines of the Stagirite, for the inſtruction of the more ignorant, and in a manner adapted to common capacities. This little work excited numbers, both in *Greece* and *Syria*, to the ſtudy of that philoſophy, whoſe proſelytes increaſed daily. The Neſtorians and Jacobites were alſo extremely diligent in the ſtudy of ARISTOTLE's writings, from whence they armed themſelves with ſophiſms and quibbles, which they employed againſt the Greeks in the controverſy concerning the nature and perſon of CHRIST.

III. The literary hiſtory of the Latins exhibits innumerable inſtances of the groſſeſt ignorance [a], which will not, however, appear ſurpriſing to ſuch as conſider, with attention, the ſtate of *Europe* in this century. If we except ſome poor remains of learning, which were yet to be found at *Rome*, and in certain cities of *Italy* [b], the ſciences ſeemed to have abandoned the continent, and fixed their reſidence in *Britain* and *Ireland* [c]. Thoſe, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were diſtinguiſhed by their learning and genius, were all (a few French and Italians excepted)

The revival of learning among the Latins by Charlemagne.

[a] Vid. STEPH. BALUZ. *Obſervat. ad Reginonem Prumienſem*, p. 540.

[b] LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiq. Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 811.

[c] JAC. USSERIUS, *Præf. ad Syllogen Epiſtolarum Hibernicarum.*

CENT. VIII. PART II.

cepted) either Britiſh or Scotch, ſuch as ALCUIN, BEDE, EGBERT, CLEMENS, DUNGALLUS, ACCA, and others. CHARLEMAGNE, whoſe political talents were embelliſhed by a conſiderable degree of learning, and an ardent zeal for the culture of the ſciences, endeavoured to diſpel the profound ignorance that reigned in his dominions; in which excellent undertaking he was animated and directed by the counſels of ALCUIN. With this view he drew, firſt from *Italy*, and afterwards from *Britain* and *Ireland*, by his liberality, eminent men, who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the various branches of literature; and excited the ſeveral orders of the clergy and monks by various encouragements, and the nobility, and others of eminent rank, by his own example, to the purſuit of knowledge in all its branches, human and divine.

Cathedral and monaſtic ſchools erected.

IV. In the proſecution of this noble deſign, the greateſt part of the biſhops erected, by the expreſs order of the emperor, cathedral ſchools (ſo called from their lying contiguous to the principal church in each dioceſe), in which the youth, which were ſet apart for the ſervice of CHRIST, received a learned and religious education. Thoſe alſo of the abbots, who had any zeal for the cauſe of Chriſtianity, opened ſchools in their monaſteries, in which the more learned of the fraternity inſtructed ſuch as were deſigned for the monaſtic ſtate, or the ſacerdotal order, in the Latin language, and other branches of learning ſuitable to their future deſtination. It was formerly believed, that the univerſity of *Paris* was erected by CHARLEMAGNE; but this opinion is rejected by ſuch as have ſtudied, with impartiality, the hiſtory of this age; though it is undeniably evident, that this great prince had the honour of laying, in ſome meaſure, the foundation of that noble inſtitution, and that the beginnings from which it

aroſe

aroſe were owing entirely to him [*d*]. However this queſtion be decided, it is undeniably certain, that the zeal of this emperor, for the propagation and advancement of letters, was very great, and manifeſted its ardor by a conſiderable number of excellent eſtabliſhments; nor among others muſt we paſs with ſilence the famous *Palatine* ſchool, which he erected with a view to baniſh ignorance from his court; and in which the princes of the blood, and the children of the nobility, were educated by the moſt learned and illuſtrious maſters of the times [*e*].

But not attended with the deſired ſucceſs.

V. Theſe excellent eſtabliſhments were not, however, attended with the deſired ſucceſs; nor was the improvement of the youth, in learning and virtue, at all proportioned to the pains that were taken, and the bounty that was beſtowed to procure them a liberal education. This, indeed, will not appear ſurpriſing, when we conſider that the moſt learned and renowned maſters of theſe times were men of very little genius and abilities, and that their ſyſtem of erudition and philoſophy was nothing more than a lean and ghaſtly ſkeleton equally unfit for ornament and uſe. The whole circle of the ſciences was compoſed of, what they called, the ſeven liberal arts, *viz.* grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, muſic, and aſtronomy [*f*]; the three former of which they diſtinguiſhed by the title of

[*d*] The reaſons that have been uſed, to prove CHARLEMAGNE the founder of the univerſity of *Paris*, are accurately collected in DU BOULAY, *Hiſtoria Academiæ Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 91. But they have been refuted by the following learned men in a victorious manner, *viz.* MABILLON, *Act. Sanct. Ord. Benedict.* tom. v. *Præf.* § 181, 182. LAUNOY. CLAUDE JOLY, *De ſcholis.*

[*e*] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 281. MABILLON, l. c. § 179.

[*f*] HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquitat. Academicæ Diſſ.* iii. p. 80. JAC. THOMASII *Programmata*, p. 368. *Obſervation. Halenſium*, tom. vi. *Obſerv.* xiv. p. 118.

trivium,

CENT. VIII. PART II.

trivium, and the four latter by that of *quadrivium*. Nothing can be conceived more wretchedly barbarous than the manner in which theſe ſciences were taught, as we may eaſily perceive from ALCUIN's treatiſe concerning them [g]; and the diſſertations of St. AUGUSTIN on the ſame ſubject, which were in the higheſt repute at this time. In the greateſt part of the ſchools, the public teachers ventured no further than the *trivium*, and confined their inſtructions to grammar, rhetoric, and logic: they, however, who, after paſſing the *trivium* and alſo the *quadrivium*, were deſirous of riſing yet higher in their literary purſuits, were exhorted to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of CASSIODORE and BOETHIUS, as if the progreſs of human knowledge was bounded by the diſcoveries of thoſe two learned writers.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government during this century.

The vices of the clergy.

I. THAT corruption of manners, which diſhonoured the clergy in the former century, increaſed, inſtead of diminiſhing, in this, and diſcovered itſelf under the moſt odious characters, both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. In the eaſt there aroſe the moſt violent diſſenſions and quarrels among the biſhops and doctors of the church, who, forgetting the duties of their ſtations, and the cauſe of CHRIST in which they were engaged, threw the ſtate into

[g] ALCUINI *Opera*, part II. p. 1245. edit. Quercetani. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the treatiſe of ALCUIN, here referred to, is not only imperfect, but is almoſt entirely tranſcribed from CASSIODORE.

com-

combuſtion by their outward clamours, and their ſcandalous diviſions; and even went ſo far as to embrue their hands in the blood of their brethren who differed from them in opinion. In the weſtern world, Chriſtianity was not leſs diſgraced by the lives and actions of thoſe who pretended to be the luminaries of the church, and who ought to have been ſo in reality, by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themſelves to their paſſions without moderation or reſtraint: they were diſtinguiſhed by their luxury, their gluttony, and their luſt; they gave themſelves up to diſſipations of various kinds, to the pleaſures of hunting, and, what was ſtill more remote from their ſacred character, to military ſtudies [*b*] and enterprizes. They had alſo ſo far extinguiſhed every principle of fear and ſhame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted againſt their vices by CARLOMAN, PEPIN, and CHARLEMAGNE, at all contribute to ſet bounds to their licentiouſneſs, or to bring about their reformation [*i*].

The veneration in which the clergy were held in the weſt.

II. It is, indeed, amazing, that, notwithſtanding the ſhocking nature of ſuch vices, eſpecially in a ſet of men whoſe profeſſion obliged them to diſplay to the world the attracting luſtre of virtuous example; and notwithſtanding the perpetual troubles and complaints which theſe vices occaſioned; the clergy were ſtill held, corrupt as they were, in the higheſt veneration, and were honoured, as a ſort of deities, by the ſubmiſſive multitude. This veneration for the biſhops and clergy, and the influence and authority it gave them over the people, were, indeed, carried much higher in the weſt than in the eaſtern pro-

[*b*] STEPH. BALUZIUS, *ad Reginon. Prumienſem*, p. 563. WILKINS, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 90.

[*i*] STEPH. BALUZ. *Capitular. regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 189. 208. 275. 493, &c.

vinces;

CENT. VIII. PART II.

inces; and the reaſons of this difference will appear manifeſt to ſuch as conſider the cuſtoms and manners that prevailed among the barbarous nations, which were, at this time, maſters of *Europe*, before their converſion to Chriſtianity. All theſe nations, during their continuance under the darkneſs of paganiſm, were abſolutely enſlaved to their prieſts, without whoſe counſel and authority they tranſacted nothing of the leaſt importance either in civil or military affairs [*k*]. Upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, they, therefore, thought proper to transfer to the miniſters of their new religion, the rights and privileges of their

[*k*] JULIUS CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. v. cap. 13. "Druides magno ſunt apud eos honore: nam fere de omnibus "controverſiis, publicis privatiſque, conſtituunt; et, ſi quod "eſt admiſſum facinus, ſi cædes facta, ſi de hæreditate, ſi de "finibus controverſia eſt, iidem decernunt, præmia, pœnaſ- "que conſtituunt: ſi qui aut publicus eorum decreto non "ſtetit, ſacrificiis interdicunt—Druides a bello abeſſe conſue- "verunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt: militiæ "vacationem, omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. Tan- "tis excitati præmiis, et ſua ſponte multi in diſciplinam con- "veniunt, et a parentibus propinquiſque mittuntur." TACITUS (*De mor. Germanorum*, cap. 7. p. 384. edit. Gronov.) expreſſes alſo the power and authority of the prieſts or Druids in the following terms: "Neque enim animadvertere, neque "vincire, neque verberare quidem, niſi ſacerdotibus permiſ- "ſum, non quaſi in pœnam, nec ducis juſſu, ſed velut Deo "imperante." And again, cap. ii. "Silentium per ſacerdo- "tes, quibus et tum coërcendi jus eſt, imperatur." HELMOLDUS, *Chron. Sclavorum*, lib. i. cap. xxxvi. p. 90. expreſſes himſelf to the ſame purpoſe, "Major Flaminis, quam "Regis, apud ipſos veneratio eſt." And again, lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 235. "Rex apud eos modicæ æſtimationis eſt "comparatione Flaminis. Ille enim reſponſa perquirit—Rex "et populus ad illius nutum pendent." This ancient cuſtom of honouring their prieſts, and ſubmitting, in all things, to their deciſions, was ſtill preſerved by the Germans, and the other European nations, after their converſion to Chriſtianity: and this furniſhes a ſatisfactory anſwer to that queſtion, *viz.* How it came to paſs that the Chriſtian prieſthood obtained in the weſt that enormous degree of authority, which is ſo contrary to the poſitive precepts of CHRIST, and the nature and genius of his divine religion.

former

former priests: and the Christian bishops, in their turn, were not only ready to accept the offer, but used all their diligence and dexterity to secure and assert to themselves and their successors, the dominion and authority which the ministers of paganism had usurped over an ignorant and brutish people.

Their riches increased, and their privileges multiplied.

III. The honours and privileges, which the western nations had voluntarily conferred upon the bishops, and other doctors of the church, were now augmented with new and immense accessions of opulence and authority. The endowments of the church and monasteries, and the revenues of the bishops, were hitherto considerable; but in this century a new and ingenious method was found out of acquiring much greater riches to the church, and of increasing its wealth through succeeding ages. An opinion prevailed universally at this time, though its authors are not known, that the punishment which the righteous judge of the world has reserved for the transgressions of the wicked, was to be prevented and annulled, by liberal donations to God, to the saints, to the churches and clergy. In consequence of this notion, the great and opulent, who were, generally speaking, the most remarkable for their flagitious and abominable lives, offered, out of the abundance which they had received by inheritance, or acquired by rapine, rich donations to departed saints, their ministers upon earth, and the keepers of the temples that were erected in their honour, in order to avoid the sufferings and penalties annexed by the priests to transgression in this life [*l*], and to escape the misery denounced

[*l*] The temporal penalties here mentioned were rigorous fasts, bodily pains and mortifications, long and frequent prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and martyrs, and such like austerities. These were the penalties which the priests

ced againſt the wicked in a future ſtate. This new and commodious method of making atonement for iniquity, was the principal ſource of thoſe immenſe treaſures, which, from this period, began to flow in upon the clergy, the churches, and monaſteries, and continued to enrich them through ſucceeding ages down to the preſent time [*m*].

They are inveſted with principalities and royal domains.

IV. But here it is highly worthy of obſervation, that the donations which princes and perſons of the firſt rank preſented, in order to make expiation for their ſins, and to ſatisfy the juſtice of God, and the demands of the clergy, did not only conſiſt in thoſe *private* poſſeſſions, which every citizen may enjoy, and with which the churches and convents were already abundantly enriched; no: theſe donations were carried to a much more extravagant length, and the church was endowed with ſeveral of thoſe *public* grants, which are peculiar to princes and ſovereign ſtates, and which are commonly called *regalia*, or royal domains. Emperors, kings, and princes, ſignalized their ſuperſtitious veneration for the clergy, by inveſting biſhops, churches, and monaſteries, in the poſſeſſion of whole provinces, cities, caſtles, and fortreſſes, with all the rights and prerogatives of ſovereignty that were annexed to them under the dominion of their former maſters. Hence it

prieſts impoſed upon ſuch as had confeſſed their crimes: and as they were ſingularly grievous to thoſe who had led voluptuous lives, and were deſirous of continuing in the ſame courſe of licentious pleaſure, effeminacy, and eaſe; the richer ſort of tranſgreſſors embraced eagerly this new method of expiation, and willingly gave a part of their ſubſtance to avoid ſuch ſevere and rigorous penalties.

[*m*] Hence, by a known form of ſpeech, they who offered donations to the church or clergy were ſaid to do this for *the redemption of their ſoul*; and the gifts themſelves were generally called *the price of tranſgreſſion*. See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Diſſ. de Redemptione Peccatorum*, in his *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 712.

came to paſs that they, who, by their holy profeſſion, were appointed to proclaim to the world the vanity of human grandeur, and to inſpire into the minds of men, by their inſtructions and their example, a noble contempt of ſublunary things, became themſelves ſcandalous ſpectacles of worldly pomp, ambition, and ſplendour; were created *dukes*, *counts*, and *marquiſes*, judges, legiſlators, and ſovereigns; and not only gave laws to nations, but alſo, upon many occaſions, gave battle to their enemies at the head of numerous armies of their own raiſing. It is here that we are to look for the ſource of thoſe dreadful tumults and calamities that ſpread deſolation through *Europe* in after-times, particularly of thoſe bloody wars concerning *inveſtitures*, and thoſe obſtinate contentions and diſputes about the *regalia*.

The cauſes of this exceſſive liberality to the clergy.

V. The exceſſive donations that were made to the clergy, and that extravagant liberality that augmented daily the treaſures of the European churches (to which theſe donations and this liberality were totally confined) began in this century; nor do we find any examples of the like munificence in preceding times. From hence we may conclude that theſe donations were owing to cuſtoms peculiar to the European nations, and to the maxims of policy that were eſtabliſhed among thoſe warlike people. The kings of theſe nations, who were employed either in uſurpation or ſelf-defence, endeavoured, by all means, to attach warmly to their intereſts thoſe whom they conſidered as their friends and clients; and, for this purpoſe, they diſtributed among them extenſive territories, cities, and fortreſſes, with the various rights and privileges belonging to them, reſerving to themſelves no more than the ſupreme dominion, and alſo the military ſervice of their powerful vaſſals. This then being the method of

governing cuſtomary in *Europe*, it was eſteemed by princes a high inſtance of political prudence to diſtribute among the biſhops, and other Chriſtian doctors, the ſame ſort of donations that they had formerly made to their generals and clients; for it is not to be believed, that ſuperſtition alone was always the principle that drew forth their liberality. They expected more fidelity and loyalty from a ſet of men, who were bound by the obligations of religion, and conſecrated to the ſervice of God, than from a body of nobility, compoſed of fierce and impetuous warriors, and accuſtomed to little elſe than bloodſhed and rapine. And they hoped alſo to check the ſeditious and turbulent ſpirits of their vaſſals, and maintain them in their obedience, by the influence and authority of the biſhops, whoſe commands were highly reſpected, and whoſe ſpiritual thunderbolts, rendered formidable by ignorance, ſtruck terror into the boldeſt and moſt reſolute hearts [*n*].

VI.

[*n*] The account here given of the riſe of the clergy to ſuch enormous degrees of opulence and authority, is corroborated by the following remarkable paſſage of WILLIAM of MALMESBURY (lib. v. *De rebus geſtis regum Angliæ*), "Carolus Magnus, pro contundenda gentium illarum ferocia, omnes pene terras eccleſiis contulerat, conſilioſiſſime perpendens, nolle ſacri ordinis homines, tam facile quam Laicos, fidelitatem Domini rejicere: præterea ſi Laici rebellarent, illos poſſe excommunicationis auctoritate et potentiæ ſeveritate compeſcere." This is, doubtleſs, the true reaſon why CHARLEMAGNE, who was far from being a ſuperſtitious prince, or a ſlave to the clergy, augmented ſo vaſtly the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif in Germany, Italy, and the other countries, where he had extended his conqueſts, and accumulated upon the biſhops ſuch ample poſſeſſions. He expected more loyalty and ſubmiſſion from the clergy than from the laity; and he augmented the riches and authority of the former, in order to ſecure his throne againſt the aſſaults of the latter. As the biſhops were univerſally held in the higheſt veneration, he made uſe of their influence in checking the rebellious

VI. This prodigious acceſſion to the opulence and authority of the clergy in the weſt began at their head, the Roman pontif, and ſpread gradually from thence among the inferior biſhops, and alſo among the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders. The barbarous nations, who received the goſpel, looked upon the biſhop of *Rome* as the ſucceſſor of their chief *druid*, or high prieſt. And as this tremendous druid had enjoyed, under the darkneſs of paganiſm, a boundleſs authority, and had been treated with a degree of veneration, that, through its ſervile excels, degenerated into terror; ſo the barbarous nations, upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, thought proper to confer upon the chief of the biſhops the ſame honours and the ſame authority that had formerly been veſted in their *arch-druid* [o]. The Roman pon-

Particularly to the Roman pontif.

bellious ſpirit of his dukes, counts, and knights, who were frequently very troubleſome. CHARLEMAGNE, for inſtance, had much to fear from the dukes of *Benevento*, *Spoleto*, and *Capua*, when the government of the Lombards was overturned: he therefore made over a conſiderable part of *Italy* to the *Roman* pontif, whoſe ghoſtly authority, opulence, and threatnings were ſo proper to reſtrain thoſe powerful and vindictive princes from ſeditious inſurrections, or to quell ſuch tumults as they might venture to excite. Nor was CHARLEMAGNE the only prince who honoured the clergy from ſuch political views; the other kings and princes of *Europe* acted much in the ſame manner, and from the ſame principles, as will appear evident to all who conſider, with attention, the forms of government, and the methods of governing, that took place in this century. So that the exceſſive augmentation of ſacerdotal opulence and authority, which many look upon as the work of ſuperſtition alone, was, in many inſtances, an effect of political prudence. We ſhall conſider, preſently, the terrors of *excommunication*, which WILLIAM of MALMESBURY touches but curſorily in the latter words of the paſſage above quoted.

[o] CÆSAR ſpeaks thus of the chief or arch-druid: "His "omnibus druidibus præeſt unus, qui SUMMAM inter eos "(Celtas) habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo, ſi qui ex reli- "quis excellit dignitate, ſuccedit. At ſi ſunt plures pares, "ſuffragio Druidum adlegitur: nonnunquam etiam armis "de principatu contenditur." Vide JUL. CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii.

tif received, with ſomething more than a mere ghoſtly delight, theſe auguſt privileges; and leſt, upon any change of affairs, attempts might be made to deprive him of them, he ſtrengthened his title to theſe extraordinary honours, by a variety of paſſages drawn from ancient hiſtory, and, what was ſtill more aſtoniſhing, by arguments of a religious nature. This conduct of a ſuperſtitious people ſwelled the arrogance of the Roman druid to an enormous ſize; and gave to the ſee of *Rome* that high pre-eminence, and that deſpotic authority, in civil and political matters, that were unknown to former ages. Hence, among other unhappy circumſtances, aroſe that moſt monſtrous and moſt pernicious opinion, that ſuch perſons as were excluded from the communion of the church by the pontif himſelf, or any of the biſhops, forfeited thereby not only their civil rights and advantages as citizens, but even the common claims and privileges of humanity. This horrid opinion, which was a fatal ſource of wars, maſſacres, and rebellions without number, and which contributed more than any thing elſe to augment and confirm the papal authority, was, unhappily for *Europe*, borrowed by Chriſtians, or rather by the clergy, from the Pagan ſuperſtitions [*p*].

VII.

[*p*] Though *excommunication*, from the time of CONSTANTINE the Great, was, in every part of the Chriſtian world, attended with many diſagreeable effects, yet its higheſt terrors were confined to *Europe*, where its aſpect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired alſo, in the eighth century, new acceſſions of terror; ſo that, from that period, the *excommunication* practiſed in *Europe* differed entirely from that which was in uſe in other parts of *Chriſtendom*. Excommunicated perſons were indeed conſidered, in all places, as objects of averſion both to God and men: but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, nor of the rights of humanity; much leſs were thoſe kings and princes, whom an inſolent biſhop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, ſuppoſed to forfeit, on that account, their crowns or their territories. But, from this century,

VII. We ſee in the annals of the French nation the following remarkable and ſhocking inſtance of the enormous power that was, at this time, veſted in the Roman pontif. PEPIN, who was *mayor of the palace* to CHILDERIC III, and who, in the exerciſe of that high office, was poſſeſſed, in reality, of the royal power and authority, not contented with this, aſpired to the titles and honours of majeſty, and formed the deſign of dethroning his ſovereign. For this purpoſe, the ſtates of the realm were aſſembled by PEPIN, A. D. 751; and though they were devoted to the intereſts of this ambitious uſurper, they gave it as their opinion, that the biſhop of *Rome* was previouſly to be conſulted, whether the execution

The Roman pontif obtains an addition to his authority, by favouring the ambition of Pepin.

tury, it was quite otherwiſe in *Europe*; excommunication received that infernal power which diſſolved all connexions; ſo that thoſe whom the biſhops, or their chief, excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beaſts. Under this horrid ſentence, the king, the ruler, the huſband, the father, nay, even the *man*, forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of ſociety. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: Upon the converſion of the barbarous nations to Chriſtianity, theſe new and ignorant proſelytes confounded the *excommunication* in uſe among Chriſtians, with *that* which had been practiſed in the times of paganiſm by the prieſts of the gods, and conſidered them as of the ſame nature and effect. The Roman pontifs, on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error; and, therefore, employed all ſorts of means to gain credit to an opinion ſo proper to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandize, in general, the epiſcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extenſive and horrid influence of the European and Papal excommunication, will appear evident to ſuch as caſt an eye upon the following paſſage of CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii. "Si qui aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non ſtetit, ſacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna eſt apud eos graviſſima. Quibus ita eſt interdictum, ii numero impiorum et ſceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum ſermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque iis petentibus Jus REDDITUR, neque honos ullus communicatur."

CENT. VIII. PART II.

of ſuch a project was lawful or not. In conſequence of this, ambaſſadors were ſent by PEPIN to ZACHARY, the reigning pontif, with the following queſtion: *Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a puſillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of diſcharging any of the functions of royalty, and to ſubſtitute in his place one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered moſt important ſervices to the ſtate?* The ſituation of ZACHARY, who ſtood much in need of the ſuccours of PEPIN againſt the Greeks and Lombards, rendered his anſwer ſuch as the uſurper deſired. And when this favourable deciſion of the Roman oracle was publiſhed in *France*, the unhappy CHILDERIC was ſtripped of royalty without the leaſt oppoſition; and PEPIN, without the ſmalleſt reſiſtance from any quarter, ſtepped into the throne of his maſter and his ſovereign. Let the abettors of the papal authority ſee, how they can juſtify in CHRIST's pretended vicegerent upon earth, a deciſion, which is ſo glaringly repugnant to the laws and precepts of the divine Saviour [q]. This deciſion was ſolemnly confirmed by STEPHEN II., the ſucceſſor

[q] See LE COINTE *Annal. Franciæ Eccleſ.* MEZERAY, DANIEL, and the other Gallic and German hiſtorians, concerning this important event; but particularly BOSSUET *Defenſ. declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars I. p. 225. PETR. RIVAL. *Diſſertations Hiſtor. et Critiques ſur divers ſujets*, Diſſ. ii. p. 70. Diſſ. iii. p. 156. *Lond.* 1726, in 8vo. HENR. DE BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 288. This remarkable event is not, indeed, related in the ſame manner by all hiſtorians, and it is generally repreſented under the falſeſt colours by thoſe, who, from a ſpirit of blind zeal and exceſſive adulation, ſeize every occaſion of exalting the dignity and authority of the biſhops of *Rome*. Such writers aſſert, that it was by ZACHARY's authority as pontif, and not in conſequence of his opinion as a caſuiſt or divine, that the crown was taken from the head of CHILDERIC, and placed upon that of PEPIN. But this the French abſolutely and juſtly deny. Had it, however, been ſo, the crime of the pontif would have been much greater than it was in reality.

of

of ZACHARY, who undertook a journey into *France*, in the year 754, in order to ſolicit aſſiſtance againſt the Lombards; and who, at the ſame time, diſſolved the obligation of the oath of fidelity and allegiance which PEPIN had ſworn to CHILDERIC, and violated by his uſurpation, in the year 751. And to render his title to the crown as ſacred as poſſible, STEPHEN anointed and crowned him, with his wife and two ſons, for the ſecond time [r].

The advantages derived to the ſee of *Rome* from the attachments of its biſhops to the kings of *France*.

VIII. This compliance of the Roman pontifs proved an abundant ſource of opulence and credit to the church, and to its aſpiring miniſters. When that part of *Italy*, which was as yet ſubject to the Grecian empire, was involved in confuſion and trouble, by the ſeditions and tumults which aroſe from the imperial edicts [s] againſt the erection and worſhip of images; the kings of the Lombards employed the united influence of their arms and negociations in order to terminate theſe

☞ [r] PEPIN had been anointed, by the legate BONIFACE at *Soiſſons*, ſoon after his election; but thinking that ceremony performed by the pope, would recommend him more to the reſpect of his ſubjects, he deſired that it ſhould be performed anew by STEPHEN. PEPIN is the firſt French monarch who received this unction as a ceremony of coronation, at leaſt according to the reports of the moſt credible hiſtorians. His predeceſſors were proclaimed by being lifted up on a ſhield, and the *holy phial* of CLOVIS is now univerſally regarded as fabulous. The cuſtom of anointing kings at their coronation was, however, more ancient than the time of PEPIN, and was obſerved long before that period both in *Scotland* and *Spain*. See EDMUND MARTENE, *De Antiq. Eccleſ. Ritib.* tom. iii. cap. x. As alſo BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 361. 366.

☞ [s] The author has here in view the edicts of LEO ISAURICUS and CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS. The former publiſhed in the year 726, a famous edict againſt the worſhip of images, which occaſioned many conteſts and much diſturbance both in church and ſtate; and the latter aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, in the year 754, a council of 338 biſhops, who unanimouſly condemned not only the *worſhip*, but alſo, the *uſe*, of images.

conteſts. Their ſucceſs, indeed, was only advantageous to themſelves; for they managed matters ſo as to become, by degrees, maſters of the Grecian provinces in *Italy*, which were ſubject to the Exarch, who reſided at *Ravenna*. Nay, one of theſe monarchs, named AISTULPHUS, carried his views ſtill further. Elated with theſe new acceſſions to his dominions, he meditated the conqueſt of *Rome* and its territory, and formed the ambitious project of reducing all *Italy* under the yoke of the Lombards. The terrified pontif, STEPHEN II., addreſſes himſelf to his powerful patron and protector PEPIN, repreſents to him his deplorable condition, and implores his aſſiſtance. The French monarch embarks, with zeal, in the cauſe of the ſuppliant pontif; croſſes the *Alps*, A. D. 754, with a numerous army; and having defeated AISTULPHUS, obliged him, by a ſolemn treaty, to deliver up to the ſee of *Rome* the exarchate of *Ravenna*, *Pentapolis*, and all the cities, caſtles, and territories, which he had ſeized in the Roman dukedom. It was not, however, long before the Lombard prince violated, without remorſe, an engagement which he had entered into with reluctance. In the year 755 he laid ſiege to *Rome* for the ſecond time, but was again obliged to ſue for peace by the victorious arms of PEPIN, who returned into *Italy*, and forcing the Lombard to execute the treaty he had ſo audaciouſly violated, made a new grant of the exarchate [*t*], and of

The donation of Pepin to that ſee.

[*t*] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiæ*, lib. iii. p. 202. tom. ii. opp. BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366. MURATORI *Annali d' Italiæ*, tom. iv. p. 310. The real limits of the *exarchate*, granted by PEPIN to the Roman pontif, have been much controverted among the learned, and have, particularly in our times, employed the reſearches of ſeveral eminent writers. The biſhops of *Rome* extend the limits of this *exarchate* as far as they can with any appearance of decency or probability; while their adverſaries are as zealous

of *Pentapolis* to the Roman pontif and his ſucceſſors in the apoſtolic ſee of St. PETER. And thus was the biſhop of *Rome* raiſed to the rank of a temporal prince.

IX. After the death of PEPIN, a new attack was made upon the patrimony of St. PETER, by DIDERIC king of the Lombards, who invaded the territories that had been granted by the *French* monarch to the ſee of *Rome*. In this extremity, ADRIAN I., who was pontif at that time, fled for ſuccour to CHARLES, the ſon of PEPIN, who, on account of his heroic exploits, was afterwards diſtinguiſhed by the name of CHARLEMAGNE. This prince, whoſe enterpriſing genius led him to ſeize with avidity every opportunity of extending

Charlemagne's grant to the ſee of *Rome*.

ous in contracting this famous grant within narrower bounds. See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat. Eccleſiaſtique*, cap. i, ii. As alſo his *Antiquitat. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 64. 68. 986, 987. The ſame author treats the matter with more circumſpection, *tom.* v. p. 790. This controverſy can only be terminated with facility by an inſpection of PEPIN's grant of the territory in queſtion. FONTANINI, in his *Firſt defence of the temporal juriſdiction of the ſee of Rome over the city of Commachio*, written in Italian, intimates, that this grant is ſtill in being, and even makes uſe of ſome phraſes that are contained in it (ſee the pages 242 and 346 of that work). This, however, will ſcarcely be believed. Were it, indeed, true that ſuch a deed is yet in being, its being publiſhed to the world, would be, undoubtedly, unfavourable to the pretenſions and intereſts of the church of *Rome*. It is at leaſt certain, that in the recent diſpute between the emperor JOSEPH and the Roman pontif concerning the city of *Commachio*, the partiſans of the latter, though frequently called upon by thoſe of the emperor to produce this grant, refuſed conſtantly to comply with this demand. On the other hand it muſt be confeſſed, that BLANCHINUS, in his *Prolegom. ad Anaſtaſium de vitis pontif. Rom.* p. 55. has given us, from a Farneſian manuſcript, a ſpecimen of this grant, which ſeems to carry the marks of remote antiquity. Be that as it may, a multitude of witneſſes unite in aſſuring us, that the remorſe of a wounded conſcience was the ſource of PEPIN's liberality, and that his grant to the Roman pontif was the ſuperſtitious remedy by which he hoped to expiate his enormities, and particularly his horrid perfidy to his maſter CHILDERIC.

his

CENT. VIII. PART II.

his conqueſts, and whoſe veneration for the Roman ſee was carried very far, as much from the dictates of policy as ſuperſtition, adopted immediately the cauſe of the trembling pontif. He paſſed the *Alps* with a formidable army A. D. 774, overturned the empire of the Lombards in *Italy*, which had ſubſiſted above two hundred years, ſent their exiled monarch into *France*, and proclaimed himſelf king of the Lombards. Theſe conqueſts offered to CHARLEMAGNE an occaſion of viſiting *Rome*, where he not only confirmed the grants which had been made by his father to that ſee, but added to them new donations, and made to the Roman pontifs a ceſſion of ſeveral cities and provinces in *Italy*, which had not been contained in PEPIN's grant. What thoſe cities and provinces were, is a queſtion difficult to be reſolved at this period of time, as it is perplexed with much obſcurity, from the want of authentic records, by which alone it can be decided with certainty [*u*].

X. By

[*u*] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiæ*, lib. iii. p. 223. tom. ii. opp. BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 368. PETR. de MARCA, *De concordia ſacerdotii et imperii*, lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67. LUD. ANTON. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, cap. ii. p. 147. CONRINGIUS, *De Imperio Roman. German.* cap. vi. The extent of CHARLEMAGNE's grant to the ſee of *Rome* is as much diſputed as that of PEPIN's, between the partiſans of the pope, and thoſe of the emperors. They who plead the cauſe of the Roman ſee, maintain that *Corſica*, *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, the territory of *Sabino*, the dutchy of *Spoleto*, and ſeveral other places were ſolemnly granted, by CHARLEMAGNE, to St. PETER and his ſucceſſors. They, on the other hand, who aſſert the rights of the emperor, diminiſh as far as they can the munificence of CHARLES, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. The reader may conſult upon this ſubject the authors of the preſent age, who have publiſhed their opinions concerning the pretenſions of the emperors and the popes to the cities of *Commachio* and *Florence*, and the dutchies of *Parma* and *Placentia*; but above all, the learned BERRET's excellent treatiſe, intitled,

X. By this act of liberality, which ſeems to carry in it the contradictory characters of policy and imprudence, CHARLEMAGNE opened for himſelf a paſſage to the empire of the weſt, and to the ſupreme dominion over the city of *Rome* and its territory, upon which the weſtern empire ſeemed then to depend [*w*]. He had, no doubt,

The motives to which it is to be attributed.

titled, *Diſſertatio Chorographica de Italia medii ævi*, f. 33. The ſpirit of party ſeems, in this controverſy, as in many others, to have blinded the diſputants on both ſides of the queſtion; and this, together with the difficulty of avoiding miſtakes upon a point involved in ſuch deep obſcurity, has in many caſes rendered the truth inviſible to both the contending parties. With reſpect to the motives that induced CHARLEMAGNE to make this grant, they are much leſs doubtful than the extent of the grant itſelf. ADRIAN affirms, that the monarch's view was to *atone for his ſins* by this act of liberality to the church, as we ſee in a letter from that pontif to CHARLEMAGNE, which is publiſhed in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* tom. iii. part II. p. 265. and of which the following paſſage is remarkable: "Venientes ad nos de Capua, "quam beato Petro apoſtolorum principi PRO MERCEDE ANI-"MÆ VESTRÆ atque ſempiterna memoria cum ceteris civita-"tibus obtuliſtis." It is not indeed unlikely, that CHARLEMAGNE, who affected that kind of piety which was the characteriſtic of this barbarous age, mentioned this ſuperſtitious motive in the act of ceſſion by which he confirmed his donation to the church; but ſuch as are acquainted with the character of this prince, and the hiſtory of this period, will be cautious in attributing his generoſity to this religious principle alone. His grand motive was, undoubtedly, of an ambitious kind; he was obſtinately bent upon adding the weſtern empire to his dominions, and the ſucceſs of this grand project depended much upon the conſent and aſſiſtance of the Roman pontif, whoſe approbation, in thoſe times, was ſufficient to ſanctify the moſt iniquitous projects; ſo that CHARLEMAGNE laviſhed gifts upon the biſhops of *Rome*, that, by their aſſiſtance, he might aſſume, with a certain air of decency, the empire of the weſt, and confirm his new dominion in *Italy*. This policy we have taken notice of already, and it muſt appear manifeſt to all who view things with the ſmalleſt degree of impartiality and attention.

[*w*] CHARLES in reality was already emperor of the weſt, that is, the moſt powerful of the European monarchs. He wanted, therefore, nothing more than the title of emperor, and the ſupreme dominion in *Rome* and its territory, both of which he obtained by the aſſiſtance of LEO III.

been

CENT. VIII. PART II.

been meditating for a conſiderable time this arduous project, which his father PEPIN had probably formed before him, but the circumſtances of the times obliged him to wait for a favourable occaſion of putting it in execution. This was offered him in the year 800, when the affairs of the Greeks were reduced to the utmoſt extremity after the death of LEO III., and the barbarous murder of his ſon CONSTANTINE, and while the impious IRENE held the reins of empire. This favourable opportunity was ſeized with avidity by CHARLES, who ſet out for *Rome*, where he was received with the utmoſt demonſtrations of zeal by the ſovereign pontif [*x*], who had entered into his views, and perſuaded the people, elated at this time with high notions of their independency and elective power, to unite their ſuffrages in favour of this prince, and to proclaim him emperor of the weſt [*y*].

The nature and form of the Roman pontiff's juriſdiction.

XI. CHARLES, upon his elevation to the empire of the weſt and the government of *Rome*, ſeems to have reſerved to himſelf only the ſupreme dominion, and the unalienable rights of majeſty, and to have granted to the church of *Rome* a ſubordinate juriſdiction over that great city, and its

[*x*] LEO III.

[*y*] See the hiſtorians who have tranſmitted to us accounts of this century, and more eſpecially BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Romano Germani*. tom. ii. p. 537. The partiſans of the Roman pontifs generally maintain, that LEO III, by a *divine* right, veſted in him as biſhop of *Rome*, tranſported the weſtern empire from the Greeks to the Francs, and conferred it upon CHARLEMAGNE, the monarch of the latter. From hence they conclude, that the Roman pontif, as the vicar of CHRIST, is the ſupreme lord of the whole earth, and, in a particular manner, of the Roman empire. The temerity of theſe pretenſions, and the abſurdity of this reaſoning, are expoſed with much learning and judgment by the celebrated FRED. SPANHEIM, *De ficta tranſlatione imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem* III. tom. ii. opp. p. 557.

annexed

annexed territory [z]. This grant was undoubtedly ſuggeſted to him by the ambitious pontif as a matter of ſacred and indiſpenſable obligation, and many fictitious deeds were probably produced to make out the pretenſions, and juſtify

[z] That CHARLEMAGNE, in effect, preſerved entire his ſupreme authority over the city of *Rome* and its adjacent territory, gave law to the citizens by judges of his own appointment, puniſhed malefactors, enjoyed the prerogatives and exerciſed all the functions of royalty, has been demonſtrated by ſeveral of the learned in the moſt ample and ſatisfactory manner, and confirmed by the moſt unexceptionable and authentic teſtimonies. To be convinced of this, it will be ſufficient to conſult MURATORI's *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, cap. vi. p. 77. And, indeed, they muſt have a ſtrange power of reſiſting the cleareſt evidence, who are abſurd enough to aſſert, as does FONTANINI, in his treatiſe, entitled, *Dominio della S. Sede ſopra Comachio*, Diſſ. i. c. 95, 96, that CHARLES ſuſtained at *Rome* the character of the *advocate* of the Roman church, and not that of its ſovereign or its lord, the dominion of the pontifs being unlimited and univerſal. On the other hand, we muſt acknowledge ingenuouſly that the power of the pontif, both in the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory, was very great, and that, in ſeveral caſes, he ſeemed to act with a princely authority. But the extent and the foundations of that authority are matters hid in the deepeſt obſcurity, and have thereby given occaſion to endleſs diſputes. MURATORI maintains, in his work above cited, p. 102, that the biſhop of *Rome* diſcharged the function of *exarch*, or *vicar*, to the emperor, an opinion which CLEMENT XI. rejected as injurious to the papal dignity, and which, indeed, does not appear to have any ſolid foundation. After a careful examination of all the circumſtances that can contribute towards the ſolution of this perplexed queſtion, the moſt probable account of the matter ſeems to be this: That the Roman pontif poſſeſſed the city of *Rome* and its territory by the ſame right that he held the exarchate of *Ravenna* and the other lands, of which he received the grant from CHARLEMAGNE; that is to ſay, that he poſſeſſed *Rome* as a feudal tenure, though charged with leſs marks of dependance than other fiefs generally are, on account of the luſtre and dignity of a city which had been ſo long the capital of the empire. This opinion derives much ſtrength from what we ſhall have occaſion to obſerve in the following note, and it has the peculiar advantage of reconciling the jarring teſtimonies of ancient writers, and the various records of antiquity relating to this point.

the

the claims of the church to this high degree of temporal authority and civil jurisdiction. In order to reconcile the new emperor to this grant, it was no doubt alleged, that CONSTANTINE the GREAT, his renowned predeceſſor, when he removed the ſeat of the empire to *Conſtantinople*, delivered up *Rome*, the old metropolis, with its adjacent territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, to be poſſeſſed and governed by the church, and that with no other reſtriction, than that this ſhould be no detriment to his ſupreme dominion; and it was inſinuated to CHARLES, that he could not depart from the rule eſtabliſhed by that pious emperor, without incurring the wrath of God, and the indignation of St. PETER [*a*].

XII.

[*a*] Moſt writers are of opinion, that CONSTANTINE's pretended grant was poſterior to this period, and was forged in the tenth century. It appears to me, on the contrary, that this fictitious grant was in being in the eighth century, and it is extremely probable that both ADRIAN and his ſucceſſor LEO III. made uſe of it to perſuade CHARLEMAGNE to that donation. In favour of this opinion, we have the unexceptionable teſtimony of ADRIAN himſelf in his letter to CHARLEMAGNE, which is publiſhed in MURATORI's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, tom. iii. part II. p. 194. and which is extremely worthy of an attentive peruſal. In this letter, ADRIAN exhorts CHARLES, before his elevation to the empire, to order the reſtitution of all the grants and donations that had formerly been made to St. PETER, and to the church of *Rome*. In this demand alſo he diſtinguiſhes, in the plaineſt manner, the donation of CONSTANTINE from thoſe of the other princes and emperors, and, what is particularly remarkable, from the *exarchate* which was the gift of PEPIN, and even from the additions that CHARLES had already made to his father's grant; from whence we may juſtly conclude, that by the *donation of* CONSTANTINE, ADRIAN meant the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory. He ſpeaks firſt of this grant in the following terms: "Deprecamur veſtram Excellentiam ... pro Dei amore "et ipſius clavigeri regni cœlorum ... ut ſecundum promiſſionem quam polliciti eſtis eidem Dei apoſtolo PRO ANIMÆ "VESTRÆ MERCEDE et ſtabilitate regni veſtri, omnia noſtris "temporibus adimplere jubeatis ... et ſicut temporibus beati "SILVESTRI

The Grecian emperors check the ambition of the Roman pontifs, and diminish their revenues.

XII. While the power and opulence of the Roman pontifs were rising to the greatest height by the events which we have now been relating, they received a mortifying check in consequence of a quarrel which broke out between these haughty pontifs and the Grecian emperors. LEO the Isaurian, and his son CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, incensed at the zeal which GREGORY II. and III. discovered for the worship of images, not only confiscated the treasures and lands which the

"SILVESTRI Romani pontificis, a sanctæ recordationis piissimo CONSTANTINO M. Imperatore, PER EJUS LARGITATEM (here CONSTANTINE's donation is evidently mentioned) sancta Dei catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et POTESTATEM in his Hesperiæ partibus LARGIRI dignatus est: ita et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris sancta Dei ecclesia germinet . . . et amplius atque amplius exaltata permaneat . . . quia ecce novus Christianissimus Dei gratiâ CONSTANTINUS imperator (here we see CHARLES, who at that time was only a *king*, styled *emperor* by the pontif, and compared with CONSTANTINE) his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctæ suæ ecclesiæ . . . largiri dignatus est." So much for that part of the letter that relates to CONSTANTINE's grant: as to the other donations which the pontif evidently distinguishes from it, observe what follows: "SED ET CUNCTA ALIA quæ per diversos Imperatores, Patricios, etiam et alios Deum timentes, PRO EORUM ANIMÆ MERCEDE ET VENIA DELICTORUM, in partibus Tusciæ, Spoleto, seu Benevento, atque Corsica, simul et Pavinensi patrimonio, beato PETRO apostolo concessa sunt, et per nefandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum spatia abstracta et ablata sunt vestris temporibus, restituantur." (The pontif intimates further, that all these grants were carefully preserved in the office of the Lateran, and that he sends them to CHARLES by his legates.) "Unde et plures donationes in sacro nostro scrinio Lateranensi reconditas habemus, tamen et pro satisfactione Christianissimi regni vestri, per jam fatos viros, ad demonstrandum eas vobis, direximus, et pro hoc petimus eximiam præcellentiam vestram, ut in integro ipsa patrimonia beato PETRO et nobis restituere jubeatis." By this it appears that CONSTANTINE's grant was now in being among the archives of the Lateran, and was sent to CHARLEMAGNE with the other donations of kings and princes, whose examples were made use of to excite his liberality to the church.

church

church of *Rome* poſſeſſed in *Sicily*, *Calabria*, and *Apulia*, but moreover withdrew the biſhops of theſe countries, and alſo the various provinces and churches of *Illyricum*, from the juriſdiction of the Roman ſee, and ſubjected them to the ſpiritual dominion of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. And ſo inflexibly were the Grecian emperors bent upon humbling the arrogance of the Roman pontifs, that no intreaties, ſupplications, nor threats could engage them to abandon their purpoſe, or to reſtore this rich and ſignal portion of St. PETER's patrimony to his greedy ſucceſſors [*b*]. It is here that we muſt look for the original ſource, and the principal cauſe of that vehement conteſt between the Roman pontif and the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, which, in the following century, divided the Greek and Latin churches, and was ſo pernicious to the intereſts and advancement of true Chriſtianity. Theſe lamentable diviſions, which wanted no new incident to foment them, were, nevertheleſs, augmented by a controverſy which aroſe, in this century, concerning the *derivation of the Holy Spirit*, which we ſhall have occaſion to mention more largely in its proper place. But it is more than probable that this controverſy would have been terminated with the utmoſt facility, had not the ſpirits of the contending parties been previouſly exaſperated by diſputes founded upon avarice and ambition, and carried on, without either moderation or decency, by the *holy* patriarchs of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, in defence of their reſpective pretenſions.

The monaſtic diſcipline fallen into decay.

XIII. The monaſtic diſcipline was extremely relaxed at this time both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces, and, as appears by the concurring

[*b*] See MICH. LEQUIEN's *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 96. Among the Greek writers alſo THEOPHANES and others acknowledge the fact; but they are not entirely agreed about the reaſons to which it is to be attributed.

teſtimonies of the writers of this century, was fallen into a total decay. The only monks who eſcaped this general corruption, were they who paſſed their days in the deſarts of *Egypt*, *Syria*, and *Meſopotamia*, amidſt the auſterities of a wretched life, and remote from all the comforts of human ſociety: yet the merit of having preſerved their diſcipline was ſadly counterbalanced by the groſs ignorance, the fanatical madneſs, and the ſordid ſuperſtition that reigned among theſe miſerable hermits. Thoſe of the monaſtic orders who lived nearer cities and populous towns, troubled frequently the public tranquillity by the tumults and ſeditions they fomented among the multitude, ſo that it became neceſſary to check their rebellious ambition by the ſevere laws that were enacted againſt them by CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, and other emperors. The greateſt part of the weſtern monks followed, at this time, the rule of St. BENEDICT; though there were every where convents which adopted the diſcipline of other orders [*c*]. But as they increaſed in opulence they loſt ſight of all rules, and ſubmitted, at length, to no other diſcipline than that of intemperance, voluptuouſneſs, and ſloth [*d*]. CHARLEMAGNE attempted, by various edicts, to put a ſtop to this growing evil; but his efforts were attended with little ſucceſs [*e*].

XIV. This univerſal depravity and corruption of the monks gave riſe to a new order of prieſts

The origin of the order of canons.

[*c*] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad acta SS. Ord. Benedicti*, Sæc. i. p. 24. and Sæc. iv. part I. p. 26.

[*d*] The author, mentioned in the preceding note, diſcourſes with a noble frankneſs and courage concerning the corruption of the monks and its various cauſes, in the ſame work, *Præf. ad* Sæc. iv. part I. p. 64.

[*e*] See the *Capitularia Caroli*, publiſhed by BALUZIUS, tom. i. p. 148. 157. 237. 355. 366. 375. 503. Laws ſo ſevere, and ſo often repeated, ſhew evidently that the corruption of the monks muſt have been truly enormous.

CENT. VIII. PART II.

in the weſt, which was a ſort of middle order between the *monks* or *regulars*, and the *ſecular clergy*. This new ſpecies of eccleſiaſtics adopted the monaſtic diſcipline and manner of life, ſo far as to have their dwelling and their table in common, and to aſſemble themſelves at certain hours for divine ſervice; but they entered not into the vows which were peculiar to the monks, and they were alſo appointed to diſcharge the miniſterial functions in certain churches which were committed to their paſtoral direction. Theſe eccleſiaſtics were at firſt called *fratres dominici*, but ſoon after received the name of *canons* [*f*]. The common opinion attributes the inſtitution of this order to CHRODEGANGUS, biſhop of *Metz*: nor is this opinion deſtitute of truth [*g*]. For though before this time there were in *Italy*, *Africa*, and other provinces, convents of eccleſiaſtics, who lived after the manner of the *canons* [*h*]; yet CHRODEGANGUS, who, towards the middle of this century,

[*f*] See LE BEUF *Memoires ſur l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 174. the *Paris* edition, publiſhed in 1743, in 4to.

[*g*] See, for an account of CHRODEGANGUS, the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 128. CALMET, *Hiſtoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 513. *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *Martii*, p. 452. The rule which he preſcribed to his *canons*, may be ſeen in LE COINTE's *Annales Francor. Eccleſ.* tom. v. *ad A.* 757. §. 35; as alſo in the *Concilia Labbei*, tom. vii. 1444. He is not, however, the author of the rule which is publiſhed in his name, in the *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 565. LONGUEVAL, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. iv. p. 435. has given a neat and elegant abridgment of the rule of CHRODEGANGUS.

[*h*] See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Antiq. Italicar. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 185; as alſo LUD. THOMASSIN. *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ Vet. et Nov.* part I. lib. iii. The deſign of this inſtitution was truly excellent. The authors of it, juſtly ſhocked at the vicious manners of a licentious clergy, hoped that this new inſtitution would have a tendency to prevent the irregularities of that order, by delivering them from the cares, anxieties, and occupations of this preſent life. But the event has ſhewn how much theſe pious hopes have been diſappointed.

ſub-

ſubjected to this rule the clergy of *Metz*, not only added to their religious ceremonies the cuſtom of ſinging hymns and anthems to God, at certain hours, and probably a variety of rites, but alſo, by his example, excited the Francs, the Italians, and the Germans, to diſtinguiſh themſelves by their zeal in favour of the *canons*, to erect monaſteries for them, and to introduce their rule into their reſpective countries.

The authority of the Roman pontifs limited by, and ſubordinate to, that of the emperors.

XV. The ſupreme dominion over the church and its poſſeſſions was veſted in the emperors and kings, both in the eaſtern and the weſtern world. The ſovereignty of the Grecian emperors, in this reſpect, has never been conteſted; and though the partizans of the Roman pontifs endeavour to render dubious the ſupremacy of the Latin monarchs over the church, yet this ſupremacy is too manifeſt to be diſputed by ſuch as have conſidered the matter attentively [*i*], and it is acknowledged by the wiſeſt and moſt candid writers even of the Romiſh communion. ADRIAN I. in a council of biſhops aſſembled at *Rome*, conferred upon CHARLEMAGNE, and his ſucceſſors, the right of election to the ſee of *Rome* [*k*]; and though neither CHARLEMAGNE, nor his ſon LEWIS, were willing to exerciſe this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontif upon every vacancy, yet they reſerved the right of approving and confirming the perſon that was elected to that high dignity by the prieſts and people: nor was the conſecration of the elected pontif of the leaſt validity, unleſs performed in preſence of the empe-

[*i*] For an accurate account of the rights of the Grecian emperors in religious matters, we refer the reader to LEQUIEN's *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 136.

[*k*] This *Act* is mentioned by ANASTASIUS: it has been preſerved by YVO and GRATIAN, and has been the ſubject of a multitude of treatiſes.

ror's ambaſſadors [*l*]. The Roman pontifs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial deciſions as of indiſpenſable obligation, and executed them with the utmoſt punctuality and ſubmiſſion [*m*]. The kings of the Franes appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called *envoys*, to inſpect into the lives and manners of the clergy ſuperior and inferior, to take cognizance of their conteſts, to terminate their diſputes, to enact laws concerning the public worſhip, and to puniſh the crimes of the ſacred order, as well as thoſe of the other citizens [*n*]. All churches alſo, and monaſteries, were obliged to pay to the public treaſury a tribute proportioned to their reſpective lands and poſſeſſions, except ſuch as, by the pure favour of the ſupreme powers, were graciouſly exempted from this general tax [*o*].

Confined within narrow limits.

XVI. It is true, indeed, that the Latin emperors did not aſſume to themſelves the adminiſtration of the church, or the cognizance and deciſion of controverſies that were purely of a religious nature. They acknowledged, on the contrary, that theſe matters belonged to the tribunal of the Roman pontif and of the eccleſiaſtical

[*l*] See MABILLON, *Comm. in Ordinem Romanum, Muſei Italici*, tom. ii. p. 113. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, p. 87.

[*m*] This has been amply demonſtrated by BALUZIUS, in his *Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francorum*, § 21.

[*n*] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. Diſſ. ix. p. 470. FRANC. de ROYE, *De Miſſis Dominicis*, cap. x. p. 44. cap. viii. p. 118. 134. 168. 195.

[*o*] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. Diſſ. xvii. p. 926. See alſo the collection of the various pieces that were publiſhed on occaſion of the diſpute between LEWIS XV. and his clergy, relating to the immunities of that order in *France*. Theſe pieces were printed at the *Hague* in the year 1751, in ſeven volumes, 8vo, under the following title: *Ecrits pour et contre les immunités pretendués par le Clergé de France*.

coun-

councils [*p*]. But this juriſdiction of the pontif was confined within narrow limits; he could decide nothing by his ſole authority, but was obliged to convene a council when any religious differences were to be terminated by an authoritative judgment. Nor did the provinces, when any controverſy aroſe, wait for the deciſion of the biſhop of *Rome*; but aſſembled, by their own authority, their particular councils, in which the biſhops gave their thoughts, with the utmoſt freedom, upon the points in debate, and voted often in direct oppoſition to what was known to be the opinion of the Roman pontif: all which is evident from what paſſed in the councils aſſembled by the Franes and Germans, in order to determine the celebrated controverſy concerning the uſe and worſhip of images. It is further to be obſerved, that the power of convening councils, and the right of preſiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and ſovereign princes, in whoſe dominions theſe aſſemblies were held; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws, until they were approved and confirmed by the ſupreme magiſtrate [*q*]. Thus was the ſpiritual authority of *Rome* wiſely bounded by the civil power; but its ambitious pontifs fretted under the imperial curb, and eager to break looſe their bonds, left no means unemployed for that purpoſe. Nay, they formed projects, which ſeemed leſs the effects of ambition than of phrenzy; for they claimed a ſupreme dominion, not only over the church, but alſo over kings themſelves,

[*p*] See the Diſſertation of CHARLEMAGNE, *De Imaginibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 48. edit. *Heumann*.

[*q*] All this is fully and admirably demonſtrated by BALUZIUS, in his Preface to the *Capitularia*, or laws of the kings of the Franes, and is alſo amply illuſtrated in that work. See alſo J. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 270. and

CENT. VIII. PART II.

and pretended to reduce the whole univerſe under their ghoſtly juriſdiction. However extravagant theſe pretenſions were, they were followed by the moſt vigorous efforts, and the wars and tumults that aroſe in the following century, contributed much to render theſe efforts ſucceſsful.

Grecian and eaſtern writers.

XVII. If we turn our eyes towards the writers of this century, we ſhall find very few that ſtand diſtinguiſhed in the liſts of fame, either on account of erudition or genius. Among the Greeks, the following only ſeem worthy of mention.

GERMANUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; the greateſt part of whoſe high renown was due to his violent zeal for image-worſhip [r].

COSMAS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; who acquired ſome reputation by his Lyric vein, conſecrated to the ſervice of religion, and employed in compoſing hymns for public and private devotion.

GEORGE SYNCELLUS and THEOPHANES, who are not the leaſt conſiderable among the writers of the Byzantine hiſtory, though they be in all reſpects infinitely below the ancient Greek and Latin hiſtorians.

But the writer, who ſurpaſſed all his contemporaries among the Greeks and Orientals, was JOHN DAMASCENUS, a man of genius and eloquence, who, in a variety of productions full of erudition, explained the Peripatetic philoſophy, and illuſtrated the main and capital points of the Chriſtian doctrine. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the eminent talents of this great man were tainted with that ſordid ſuperſtition, and that exceſſive veneration for the ancient fathers, that were the reigning defects of the age he lived in, not to mention his wretched method of explaining

[r] See RICH. SIMON. *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 270.

the

the doctrines of the gospel according to the principles of the Aristotelian philosophy [*s*].

Western and Latin writers.

XVIII. The first place among the Latin writers is due to CHARLEMAGNE, whose love of letters was one of the bright ornaments of his imperial dignity. The laws which are known by the title of *Capitularia*, with several *Epistles*, and a *Book concerning images*, are attributed to this prince; though it seems highly probable, that the most of these compositions were drawn up by other pens [*t*].

After this learned prince, we may justly place venerable BEDE so called from his illustrious virtues [*u*]; ALCUIN [*w*], the preceptor of CHARLEMAGNE; PAULINUS of *Aquileia* [*x*], who were all distinguished by their laborious application, and their zeal for the advancement of learning and science, and who treated the various branches of literature, that were known in this century, in such a manner as to convince us, that it was the infelicity of the times, rather than the want of genius, that hindered them from arising to higher degrees of perfection than what they attained to. Add to these, BONIFACE, of whom we

[*s*] BAYLE *Diction.* tom. ii. p. 950; as also the account of the writings of JOHN DAMASCENUS, which is published in LE QUIEN's edition of his works, and was composed by LEO ALLATIUS.

[*t*] See Jo A. FABRICII *Bibliotheca medii ævi Lat.* tom. i. p. 936 *Histoire Litteraire de France*, tom. iv. p. 378.

[*u*] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. *April.* p. 866. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article BEDE. A list of the writings of this venerable *Briton*, composed by himself, is published by MURATORI, in his *Antiq. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 825.

[*w*] *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 295. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article ALCUIN CATELINOT, who has discovered the treatise of ALCUIN, *De Processione Spiritus S.* which has never been published, is preparing an edition of all the works of that learned writer. See the *Hist. Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. *Præf.* p. 10.

[*x*] See *Hist. Litteraire*, &c. tom. iv. p. 286. *Acta Sanct.* tom. i. *Januar.* p. 713.

have

CENT. VIII. PART II.

have already ſpoken; EGINARD, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, and other productions; PAUL, the deacon, who acquired a conſiderable and laſting reputation by his *Hiſtory of the Lombards*, his *Book of Homilies*, and his miſcellaneous labours; AMBROSE AUTHPERT, who wrote a commentary on the *Revelations*; and THEODULPHUS, biſhop of *Orleans*; and thus we ſhall have a complete liſt of all the writers who acquired any degree of eſteem in this century by their literary productions, either ſacred or profane.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church during this century.

The Chriſtian doctrine ſadly corrupted.

I. THE fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity were, as yet, reſpected and preſerved in the theological writings both of the Greeks and Latins, as ſeems evident from the diſcourſe of JOHN DAMASCENUS *concerning the orthodox faith*, and the confeſſion of faith which was drawn up by CHARLEMAGNE [*y*]. The pure ſeed of celeſtial truth was, however, choked by a monſtrous and incredible quantity of noxious weeds. The rational ſimplicity of the Chriſtian worſhip was corrupted by an idolatrous veneration for images, and other ſuperſtitious inventions, and the ſacred

[*y*] See the treatiſe of this prince, *Concerning images*, book III. p. 259. ed. *Heumanni*. Of the Greek writers, the reader may conſult MICH. SYNCELLUS's *Confeſſion of faith*, publiſhed by MONTFAUCON, in his *Bibliotheca Coiſliniana*, p. 90: and, among the Latins, *An expoſition of the principal doctrine of the Chriſtian religion*, compoſed by BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, and publiſhed by BALUZIUS, in his *Miſcellanea*, tom. v. p. 56; as alſo the *Creed* of LEO III. publiſhed in the ſame work, tom. vii. p. 18.

flame

flame of divine charity was extinguiſhed by the violent contentions and animoſities which the progreſs of theſe ſuperſtitions occaſioned in the church. All acknowledged the efficacy of our Saviour's merits: and yet all, one way or another, laboured, in effect, to diminiſh the perſuaſion of this efficacy in the minds of men, by teaching, that Chriſtians might appeaſe an offended deity by voluntary acts of mortification, or by gifts and oblations laviſhed upon the church, and by exhorting ſuch as were deſirous of ſalvation to place their confidence in the works and merits of the ſaints. Were we to enlarge upon all the abſurdities and ſuperſtitions which were invented to flatter the paſſions of the miſguided multitude, and to increaſe, at the expence of reaſon and Chriſtianity, the opulence and authority of a licentious clergy; ſuch an immenſe quantity of odious materials would ſwell this work to an enormous ſize.

The piety and morals of this age.

II. The piety in vogue during this and ſome ſucceeding ages conſiſted in building, and embelliſhing churches and chapels, in endowing monaſteries, erecting baſilics, hunting after the relics of ſaints and martyrs, and treating them with an exceſſive and abſurd veneration, in procuring the interceſſion of the ſaints by rich oblations or ſuperſtitious rites, in worſhipping images, in pilgrimages to thoſe places which were eſteemed holy, and chiefly to *Paleſtine*, and ſuch like abſurd and extravagant practices and inſtitutions. The pious Chriſtian, and the profligate tranſgreſſor, ſhewed equal zeal in the performance of theſe ſuperſtitious ſervices, which were looked upon as of the higheſt efficacy in order to the attainment of eternal ſalvation; they were performed by the latter as an expiation for their crimes, and a mean of appeaſing an offended deity; and by the former with a view to obtain, from above, the good things

CENT. VIII. PART II.

things of this life, and an eaſy and commodious paſſage to life eternal. The true genuine religion of JESUS, if we except a few of its doctrines contained in the *Creed*, was utterly unknown in this century, not only to the multitude in general, but alſo to the doctors of the firſt rank and eminence in the church, and the conſequences of this corrupt ignorance were fatal to the intereſts of virtue. All orders of men, regardleſs of the obligations of morality, of the duties of the goſpel, and of the culture and improvement of their minds, ruſhed headlong with a perfect ſecurity into all ſorts of wickedneſs, from the deluſive hopes, that by the interceſſion and prayers of the ſaints, and the credit of the prieſts at the throne of God, they would eaſily obtain the remiſſion of their enormities, and render the deity propitious. This diſmal account of the religion and morals of the eighth century, is confirmed by the unanimous teſtimony of all the hiſtorians who have written concerning that period.

Exegetical or explanatory theology.

III. The Greeks were of opinion, that the holy ſcriptures had been ſucceſsfully interpreted and explained by the ancient commentators, and therefore imagined, that they rendered a moſt important ſervice to the ſtudents in divinity, when, without either judgment or choice, they extracted or compiled from the works of theſe admired ſages their explanatory obſervations on the ſacred writings. The commentary of JOHN DAMASCENUS upon the epiſtles of St. PAUL, which was taken from the writings of CHRYSOSTOM, is alone ſufficient to ſerve as a proof of the little diſcernment with which theſe compilations were generally made.

The Latin expoſitors may be divided into two claſſes, according to the different nature of their productions. In the firſt, we place thoſe writers who, after the example of the Greeks, employed their

their labour in collecting into one body the interpretations and commentaries of the ancients. BEDE diſtinguiſhed himſelf among the expoſitors of this claſs by his explication of the epiſtles of St. PAUL, drawn from the writings of AUGUSTIN and others [z]. Still more eſtimable are the writers of the ſecond claſs, who made uſe of their own penetration and ſagacity in inveſtigating the ſenſe of the holy ſcriptures. Such as ALCUIN, AMBROSE AUTHPERT, the expoſitors of the *Revelations*, nay and BEDE alſo, who belongs, in reality, to both claſſes. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that all theſe commentators were deſtitute of the qualities that are eſſential to the ſacred critic; for we find them in their explications neglecting entirely the natural ſenſe of the words of ſcripture, and running blindfold after a certain hidden and myſtical meaning, which, to uſe their jargon, they uſually divided into *allegorical*, *anagogical*, and *tropological* [a]; and thus they delivered their own raſh fictions and crude fancies, as the true and genuine ſentiments of the ſacred writers. Of this we are furniſhed with many examples in ALCUIN's *commentary on St. John*; BEDE's *allegorical illuſtrations of the books of Samuel*; and CHARLEMAGNE's *book concerning images*, in which various paſſages of the holy ſcriptures are occaſionally explained according to the taſte of the times [b].

IV. The veneration of CHARLEMAGNE for the ſacred writings was carried to ſuch an exceſſive length,

Charlemagne's zeal for the ſtudy of the ſcriptures.

[z] See, for an account of the commentaries of BEDE, RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſiaſt. de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 280. See alſo BEDÆ *Explicatio Geneſeos ex patribus in* MARTENE's *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 111. 116. 140. and his interpretation of *Habakkuk*, ibid. p. 295.

[a] See CAROLUS MAGNUS *De Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 138.

[b] See the ſame imperial author, book I. p. 84. 91. 123. 127. 131. 133. 136. 138. 145. 160. 164, 165, &c.

length [c], as to perſuade that monarch, that they contained the latent ſeeds and principles of all arts and ſciences; an opinion, no doubt, which he early imbibed from the leſſons of his preceptor ALCUIN, and the other divines who frequented his court [d]. Hence the zeal with which that prince excited and encouraged the more learned among the clergy to direct their pious labours towards the illuſtration of the holy ſcriptures. Several laws which he publiſhed to encourage this ſpecies of learning are yet extant, as alſo various monuments of his deep ſolicitude about the advancement and propagation of Chriſtian knowledge [e]. And leſt the faults that were to be found in ſeveral places of the Latin tranſlation of the ſcriptures ſhould prove an obſtacle to the execution and accompliſhment of his pious views, he employed ALCUIN in correcting theſe errors, and is ſaid, in the laſt years of his life, to have ſpent a conſiderable part of his time in the ſame learned and pious work [f]. It is alſo to his encouragement and direction, that ſome writers attribute the firſt German tranſlation of the ſacred writings, though others contend, that this honour is due to his ſon and ſucceſſor LEWIS, ſurnamed the MEEK.

Miſſes its aim by ſome imprudent appointments of that emperor.

V. This zeal and induſtry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouze from their ſloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raiſe up a ſpirit of application to literary purſuits. We cannot, however, help obſerving, that this laborious prince imprudently eſtabliſhed certain cuſtoms, and confirmed others, which had a manifeſt tendency to defeat, in a great meaſure, his laudable deſigns

[c] See CAROLUS MAGNUS, *De Imagin.* lib. i. p. 231. 236.
[d] Jo. FRICKIUS, *De Canone Scripturæ Sacræ*, p. 184.
[e] BARONIUS *Annal. ad* A. DCCLXXVIII. n. XXVII. Jo. A. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. JAC. USSERIUS, *De ſacris et ſcripturis vernacul.* p. 110.
[f] J. A. FABRICII *Bibl. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. USSERIUS, *De ſacris et ſcripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

of

of promoting Chriſtian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in uſe, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public aſſemblies, certain portions only of the ſcriptures; and reduced the different methods of worſhip followed in different churches into one fixed rule, which was to be obſerved with the moſt perfect uniformity in all [g]. Perſuaded alſo that few of the

[g] They who imagine that the portions of ſcripture which are ſtill explained, every year, to Chriſtians in their religious aſſemblies, were ſelected for that purpoſe by the order of CHARLEMAGNE, are undoubtedly miſtaken; ſince it is manifeſt, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of ſcripture ſet apart for each day of worſhip in the greateſt part of the Latin churches. See Jo. HENRI. THAMERI *Schediaſma de origine et dignitate pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epiſtolæ vulgo vocantur.* See alſo J. FRANC. BUDDEI *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1640. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that CHARLEMAGNE introduced ſome new regulations into this part of divine ſervice; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in ſeveral circumſtances of the public worſhip, and particularly in this, that the ſame portions of ſcripture were not read and explained in them all, he publiſhed a ſolemn edict, commanding all the religious aſſemblies within his territories to conform themſelves to the rule of worſhip and divine ſervice eſtabliſhed in the *church of Rome*. With reſpect to the portions of ſcripture which we call the *epiſtles* and *goſpels*, and which, from the time of CHARLEMAGNE down to us, continue to be uſed in divine worſhip, it is certain that they were read in the church of *Rome* ſo early as the ſixth century. It is alſo certain, that this prince was extremely careful in reforming the ſervice of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worſhip uſed at *Rome* to be obſerved in them all. Hence the churches, which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different *epiſtles* and *goſpels* from thoſe which are uſed by us and the other weſtern churches, who were commanded by CHARLEMAGNE to imitate the Roman ſervice. The church of *Corbetta* is an example of this, as may be ſeen in MURATORI's *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 836; and alſo the church of *Milan*, which follows the rite of St. AMBROSE. If any are deſirous to know what *epiſtles* and *goſpels* were uſed by the Franks and other weſtern churches before the time of CHARLEMAGNE, they have only to conſult the *Calendars* publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 66. the *Diſcourſes* of BEDE, publiſhed in the ſame work, tom. v. p. 339. and MABILLON, *De Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana*; to all which may be added PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle de Roi de France*, p. 566.

clergy

CENT. VIII. PART II.

clergy were capable of explaining with perſpicuity and judgment the portions of ſcripture which are diſtinguiſhed in the ritual by the name of epiſtle and goſpel, he ordered PAUL DEACON and ALCUIN to compile, from the ancient doctors of the church, *homilies*, or diſcourſes upon the epiſtles and goſpels, which a ſtupid and ignorant ſet of prieſts were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave riſe to that famous collection, which went by the title of the *homiliarium of Charlemagne* [*h*], and which being followed as a model by many productions of the ſame kind compoſed by private perſons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nouriſh the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthleſs clergy [*i*]. The zeal and activity of this great prince did not ſtop here; for he ordered the lives of the principal ſaints to be written in a moderate volume, of which copies were diſperſed throughout his dominions, that the people might have in the dead, examples of piety and virtue, which were no where to be found among the living. All theſe projects and deſigns were certainly formed and executed with upright and pious intentions, and, conſidering the ſtate

[*h*] See, for an account of this book of *Homilies*, the learned SEELEN's *Selecta Litteraria*, p. 252.

[*i*] ALAN, abbot of *Farfa* in *Italy*, wrote in this century an enormous *Book of Homilies*, the preface to which is publiſhed by BERNARD PEZIUS, in the *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. vi. part I. p. 83. In the following age ſeveral works under the ſame title were compoſed by learned men; one by HAGMO, of *Halberſtadt*, which is ſtill extant; another by RABANUS MAURUS, at the requeſt of the emperor LOTHAIRE; and a third by HERICUS, mentioned by PEZIUS in the work above quoted, p. 93. All theſe were wrote in Latin. The famous OTTFRID, of *Weiſſenbourg*, was the firſt who compoſed a *Book of Homilies* in the Teutonic language; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, ſee LAMBECIUS, *De Bibliotheca Vindobon. Auguſta*, tom. ii. cap. v. p. 419.

of

of things in this century, were, in ſeveral reſpects, both uſeful and neceſſary; they, however, contrary to the emperor's intention, contributed, undoubtedly, to encourage the prieſts in their criminal ſloth, and their ſhameful neglect of the ſtudy of the ſcriptures. For the greateſt part of them employed their time and labour only upon thoſe parts of the ſacred writings, which the emperor had appointed to be read in the churches, and explained to the people; and never attempted to exerciſe their capacities upon the reſt of the divine word. The greateſt part of the clergy alſo, inſtead of compoſing themſelves the diſcourſes they recited in public, confined themſelves to their book of homilies, that was publiſhed by the authority of their ſovereign, and thus let their talents lie uncultivated and unemployed.

The ſtate of didactic theology.

VI. None of the Latins carried their theological enterprizes ſo far as to give a complete, connected, and accurate ſyſtem of the various doctrines of Chriſtianity. It would be abſurd to comprehend, under this title, the various diſcourſes concerning the perſon and nature of CHRIST, which were deſigned to refute the errors of FELIX [*k*] and ELIPAND, or to combat the opinions which were now ſpread abroad concerning the origin of the Holy Ghoſt [*l*], and ſeveral other points; ſince theſe diſcourſes afford no proofs either of preciſion or diligence in their

☞ [*k*] The doctrine taught by FELIX, biſhop of *Urgella*, and his diſciple ELIPAND, archbiſhop of *Toledo*, was, that JESUS CHRIST was the ſon of God not by *nature*, but by *adoption*. This doctrine was alſo intimately connected with the Neſtorian hypotheſis, and was condemned, in this century, by the ſynod of *Ratiſbon*, and the councils of *Francfort* and *Frioul*.

☞ [*l*] The error now publiſhed relating to the *Holy Ghoſt* was, that *it* proceeded from the father *only*, and not from the father and the ſon.

authors.

CENT. VIII. PART II.

authors. The labours and induſtry of the divines of this age were totally employed in collecting the opinions and authorities of the *fathers*, by whom are meant the theological writers of the firſt ſix centuries; and ſo blind and ſervile was their veneration for theſe doctors, that they regarded their dictates as infallible, and their writings as the boundaries of truth, beyond which reaſon was not permitted to puſh its reſearches. The Iriſh or Hibernians, who in this century were known by the name of *Scots*, were the only divines who refuſed to diſhonour their reaſon by ſubmitting it implicitly to the dictates of authority. Naturally ſubtile and ſagacious, they applied their philoſophy, ſuch as it was, to the illuſtration of the truth and doctrines of religion; a method which was almoſt generally abhorred and exploded in all other nations [*m*].

The

[*m*] That the Hibernians, who were called *Scots* in this century, were lovers of learning, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves, in theſe times of ignorance, by the culture of the ſciences beyond all the other European nations, travelling through the moſt diſtant lands, both with a view to improve and to communicate their knowledge, is a fact with which I have long been acquainted, as we ſee them, in the moſt authentic records of antiquity, diſcharging, with the higheſt reputation and applauſe, the function of doctor in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, both during this and the following century. But that theſe Hibernians were the firſt teachers of the *ſcholaſtic theology* in *Europe*, and ſo early as the eighth century illuſtrated the doctrines of religion by the principles of philoſophy, I learned but lately from the teſtimony of BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in the province of *Languedoc*, who lived in this period, and ſome of whoſe productions are publiſhed by BALUZIUS, in the fifth volume of his *Miſcellanea*. This learned abbot, in his *Letter to Guarnanius*, p. 54. expreſſes himſelf thus: "Apud modernos ſcholaſticos (*i. e.* public teachers, or ſchool-"maſters) maxime apud SCOTOS eſt ſyllogiſmus deluſionis, "ut dicant, Trinitatem, ſicut perſonarum, ita eſſe ſubſtantia-"rum;" (by this it appears that the Iriſh divines made uſe of a certain ſyllogiſm, which BENEDICT calls *deluſive*, i. e. fallacious and ſophiſtical, to demonſtrate that the *perſons* in the Godhead

I

The Greeks were not ſo deſtitute of ſyſtematical divines as the Latins. JOHN DAMASCENUS compoſed a complete body of the Chriſtian doctrine in a ſcientifical method, under the title of *Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith.* The two kinds of *Theology*, which the Latins termed *ſcholaſtic* and *didactic*, were united in this laborious performance, in which the author not only explains the doctrines he delivers by ſubtile and profound reaſoning, but alſo confirms his explications by the authority of the ancient doctors. This book was received among the Greeks with the higheſt applauſe, and was ſo exceſſively admired, that at length it came to be acknowledged among that people as the only rule of divine truth. Many, however, complain of this applauded writer, as having conſulted more, in his theological ſyſtem, the conjectures of human rea-

head were *ſubſtances:* a captious ſyllogiſm this, as we may ſee from what follows, and alſo every way proper to throw the ignorant into the greateſt perplexity) "quatenus ſi adſenſerit illectus auditor, Trinitatem eſſe trium ſubſtantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum: ſi autem abnuerit, perſonarum denegator culpetur." It was with this miſerable piece of ſophiſtry, that theſe ſubtile divines puzzled and tormented their diſciples and hearers, accuſing thoſe of *Tritheiſm* who admitted their argument, and caſting the reproach of *Sabellianiſm* upon thoſe who rejected it. For thus they reaſoned, or rather quibbled; "You muſt either affirm or deny that the Three Perſons in the Deity are Three Subſtances. If you affirm it, you are undoubtedly a *Tritheiſt*, and worſhip Three Gods: if you deny it, this denial implies that they are not three diſtinct perſons, and thus you fall into *Sabellianiſm.*" BENEDICT condemns this Hibernian ſubtilty, and ſeverely animadverts upon the introduction of it into theology; he alſo recommends in its place that amiable ſimplicity that is ſo conformable to the nature and genius of the goſpel: "Sed hæc de fide (ſays he) et omnis caliditatis verſutia ſimplicitate fidei catholicæ eſt puritate vitanda, non captioſa interjectione linguarum, ſcæva impactione interpolanda." From hence it appears, that the philoſophical or ſcholaſtic theology among the Latins, is of more ancient date than is commonly imagined.

ſon, and the opinions of the ancients, than the genuine dictates of the ſacred oracles, and of having, in conſequence of this method, deviated from the true ſource and the eſſential principles of theology [n]. To the work of DAMASCENUS now mentioned, we may add his *Sacred Parallels*, in which he has collected, with uncommon care and induſtry, the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning the various points of the Chriſtian religion. We may, therefore, look upon this writer as the THOMAS and LOMBARD of the Greeks.

Moral writers.

VII. None of the moral writers of this century attempted forming a complete ſyſtem of the duties and virtues of the Chriſtian life. JOHN, ſurnamed CARPATHIUS, a Greek writer, compoſed ſome *exhortatory diſcourſes*, in which there are ſcarcely any marks of judgment or genius. Among the monaſtic orders nothing was reliſhed but the enthuſiaſtic ſtrains of the Myſtics, and the doctrines of DIONYSIUS the Areopagite, their pretended chief, whoſe ſuppoſititious writings were interpreted and explained by JOHANNES DARENSIS out of complaiſance to the monks [o]. The Latin writers confined their labours in morality to ſome general precepts concerning virtue and vice, that ſeemed rather deſtined to regulate the external actions of Chriſtians, than to purify their inward principles, or to fix duty upon its proper foundations. Their precepts alſo, ſuch as they were, and their manner of explaining them, had now imbibed a ſtrong tincture of the Peripatetic philoſophy, as appears from certain treatiſes of BEDE, and the *treatiſe of* ALCUIN, *concerning vir-*

[n] Jo. HENR. HOTTINGER. *Bibliothecar. Quadripart.* lib. iii. cap. ii. § 3. p. 372. MART. CHEMNITIUS, *De uſu et utilitate Locor. Commun.* p. 26.

[o] Jos. SIMON ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 129.

tue

tue and vice [p]. That the people, however, might be animated to the purſuit of virtue by the commanding power of example, BEDE, FLORUS, ALCUIN, MARCELLINUS, AMBROSE AUTHPERT, and others, employed their pious induſtry in writing the lives of ſuch as had been eminent for their piety, and worthy deeds.

Controverſies.

VIII. The controverſies that turned upon the main and eſſential points of religion were, during this century, few in number, and ſcarcely any of them managed with tolerable ſagacity or judgment. The greateſt part of the Greeks were involved in the diſpute concerning images, in which their reaſonings were utterly deſtitute of preciſion and perſpicuity; while the Latins employed their chief zeal and induſtry in confuting and extirpating the doctrine of ELIPAND concerning the perſon of CHRIST. JOHN DAMASCENUS expoſed the errors of all the different ſects in a ſhort, but uſeful and intereſting treatiſe; he alſo attacked the Manichæans and Neſtorians with a particular vehemence, and even went ſo far in his polemic labours, as to combat the erroneous doctrine of the Saracens. In theſe compoſitions we find ſeveral proofs of ſubtilty and genius, but very little of that clearneſs and ſimplicity that conſtitute the chief merit of polemic writings. The Jews were left almoſt unmoleſted, as the Chriſtians were ſufficiently employed by the controverſies that had ariſen among themſelves: ANASTASIUS, abbot of *Paleſtine*, made, however, ſome attempts to ſubdue the infidelity of that obſtinate people.

The origin of the diſpute concerning the worſhip of images.

IX. Of all the controverſies which agitated and perplexed the Chriſtian church during this century, that which aroſe concerning the worſhip of

[p] This treatiſe is extant in the works of ALCUIN, publiſhed by QUERCETANUS, tom. ii. p. 1218.

images in *Greece*, and was carried from thence into both the eaſtern and weſtern provinces, was the moſt unhappy and pernicious in its conſequences. The firſt ſparks of this terrible flame, that had like to have proved fatal both to the intereſts of religion and government, had already appeared under the reign of PHILLIPICUS BARDANES, who was created emperor of the Greeks a little after the commencement of this century. This prince, with the conſent of JOHN patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, ordered a picture, which repreſented the ſixth general council, to be pulled down from its place in the church of *St. Sophia*, A. D. 712; becauſe this council had condemned the Monothelites, whoſe cauſe the emperor eſpouſed with the greateſt ardor and vehemence. Nor did BARDANES ſtop here; but ſent immediately an order to *Rome* to remove all images of that nature from the churches and other places of worſhip. His orders, however, were far from being received with ſubmiſſion, or producing their deſigned effect; on the contrary, CONSTANTINE, the Roman pontif, not only rejected, by a formal proteſt, the imperial edict, but reſolved to expreſs his contempt of it by his actions as well as his words: He ordered ſix pictures, repreſenting the ſix general councils, to be placed in the porch of *St. Peter*'s church; and, that no act of rebellion or arrogance might be left unemployed, he aſſembled a council at *Rome*, in which he cauſed the emperor himſelf to be condemned as an apoſtate from the true religion. Theſe firſt tumults were quelled by a revolution, which, the year following, deprived BARDANES of the imperial throne [q].

[q] See FRED. SPANHEMII *Hiſtoria imaginum reſtituta*, which is publiſhed in the ſecond volume of his works, and alſo printed apart. MAIMBOURG's Hiſtory of this controverſy, which is full of the moſt abſurd and malignant fictions. MURATORI *Annali d' Italia*, tom. iv. p. 221.

X. The

Its progreſs under Leo the Iſaurian.

X. The diſpute, however, broke out with redoubled fury under LEO the Iſaurian, a prince of the greateſt reſolution and intrepidity, and the new tumults it excited were both violent and durable. LEO, unable to bear any longer the exceſſive height to which the Greeks carried their ſuperſtitious attachment to the worſhip of images, and the ſharp railleries and ſerious reproaches which this idolatrous ſervice drew upon the Chriſtians from the Jews and Saracens, determined, by the moſt vigorous proceedings, to root out at once this growing evil. For this purpoſe he iſſued out an edict, A. D. 726, by which it was ordered, not only that the worſhip of images ſhould be abrogated and relinquiſhed, but alſo that all the images, except that of CHRIST's crucifixion, ſhould be removed out of the churches [*r*]. In this proceeding the emperor acted more from the impulſe of his natural character, which was warm and vehement, than from the dictates of prudence, which avoids precipitancy where prejudices are to be combated, and deſtroys and mines inveterate ſuperſtitions rather by ſlow and imperceptible attacks, than by open and violent aſſaults. The imperial edict produced ſuch effects as might have been expected from the frantic enthuſiaſm of a ſuperſti-

☞ [*r*] In this account of the imperial edict, Dr. MOSHEIM follows the opinions of BARONIUS, FLEURY, and LE SUEUR. Others affirm, with more probability, that this famous edict did not enjoin the pulling down images every where, and caſting them out of the churches, but only prohibited the paying to them any kind of adoration or worſhip. It would ſeem as if LEO was not, at firſt, averſe to the uſe of images, as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and memory; for at the ſame time that he forbid them to be worſhipped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, ſay ſome, to avoid this adoration; but afterwards finding that they were the occaſion of idolatry, he had them removed from the churches and broken.

tious people. A civil war broke out in the islands of the Archipelago, ravaged a part of *Asia*, and afterwards reached *Italy*. The people, partly from their own ignorance, but principally in consequence of the perfidious suggestions of the priests and monks, who had artfully rendered the worship of images a source of opulence to their churches and cloisters, were led to regard the emperor as an apostate, and hence they considered themselves as freed from their oath of allegiance, and from all the obligations that attach subjects to their lawful sovereign.

The contests between the partisans of images who were called *Iconoduli*, and their oppofers, who were called *Iconoclasta*.

XI. The Roman pontifs GREGORY II. and III., were the authors and ringleaders of these civil commotions and insurrections in *Italy*. The former, upon the emperor's refusing to revoke his edict against images, declared him, without hesitation, unworthy of the name and privileges of a Christian, and thus excluded him from the communion of the church; and no sooner was this formidable sentence made public, than the Romans, and other Italian provinces, that were subject to the Grecian empire, violated their allegiance, and rising in arms, either massacred or banished all the emperor's deputies and officers. LEO, exasperated by these insolent proceedings, resolved to chastise the Italian rebels, and to make the haughty pontif feel, in a particular manner, the effects of his resentment; but he failed in the attempt. Doubly irritated by this disappointment, he vented his fury against images, and their worshippers, in the year 730, in a much more terrible manner than he had hitherto done; for, in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, he degraded from his office GERMANUS, the bishop of that imperial city, who was a patron of images, put ANASTASIUS in his place, ordered all the images to be publickly burnt, and inflicted a variety of severe punishments upon such as were attached

tached to that idolatrous worſhip. Theſe rigorous meaſures divided the Chriſtian church into two violent factions, whoſe conteſts were carried on with an ungoverned rage, and produced nothing but mutual invectives, crimes, and aſſaſſinations. Of theſe factions, the one adopted the adoration and worſhip of images, and were on that account called *Iconoduli* or *Iconolatræ*; while the other maintained that ſuch worſhip was unlawful, and that nothing was more worthy of the zeal of Chriſtians, than to demoliſh and deſtroy thoſe ſtatues and pictures that were the occaſions and objects of this groſs idolatry, and hence they were diſtinguiſhed by the titles of *Iconomachi* and *Iconoclaſtæ*. The furious zeal which GREGORY II. had ſhewn in defending the odious ſuperſtition of image-worſhip, was not only imitated, but even ſurpaſſed by his ſucceſſor, who was the third pontif of that name; and though, at this diſtance of time, we are not acquainted with all the criminal circumſtances that attended the intemperate zeal of theſe inſolent prelates, yet we know with the utmoſt certainty, that it was owing to their extravagant attachment to image-worſhip that the Italian provinces were torn from the Grecian empire [*s*].

XII.

[*s*] The Greek writers tell us, that both the GREGORIES carried their inſolence ſo far as to excommunicate LEO and his ſon CONSTANTINE, to diſſolve the obligation of the oath of allegiance, which the people of *Italy* had taken to theſe princes, and to prohibit their paying tribute to them, or ſhewing them any marks of ſubmiſſion and obedience. Theſe facts are alſo acknowledged by many of the partiſans of the Roman pontifs, ſuch as BARONIUS, SIGONIUS *De Regno Italiæ*, and their numerous followers. On the other hand, ſome learned writers, particularly among the French, alleviate conſiderably the crime of the GREGORIES, and poſitively deny that they either excommunicated the emperors above mentioned, or called off the people from their duty and allegiance. See LAUNOIUS, *Epiſtolar.* lib. vii. *Ep.* vii. p. 456. tom. v. opp. par.

CENT. VIII. PART II.

Their progreſs under Conſtantine Copronymus.

XII. CONSTANTINE, to whom the furious tribe of the image-worſhippers had given by way of deriſion the name of COPRONYMUS [*t*], ſucceeded his father LEO in the empire A. D. 741, and, animated with an equal zeal and ardour againſt the new idolatry, employed all his influence in extirpating and aboliſhing the worſhip of images, in oppoſition to the vigorous efforts of the Roman pontifs, and the ſuperſtitious monks. His manner of proceeding was attended with greater marks of equity and moderation, than had appeared in the meaſures purſued by LEO; for, knowing the reſpect which the Greeks had for the deciſions of general councils, whoſe authority they conſidered as ſupreme and unlimited in religious matters, he aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, A. D. 754, a council compoſed of the eaſtern biſhops, in order to have this important queſtion examined with the utmoſt care, and decided with wiſdom, ſeconded by a juſt and lawful authority. This

par. II. NAT. ALEXANDER, *Select. Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt. Capit.* Sæc. viii. Diſſert. i. p. 456. PETR. de MARCA, *Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. iii. cap. xi. BOSSUET, *Defenſ. Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de poteſtate Eccleſ.* par. I. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 197. GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire Civile de Naples*, tom. i. p. 400. All theſe found their opinions, concerning the conduct of the GREGORIES, chiefly upon the authority of the Latin writers, ſuch as ANASTASIUS, PAUL DEACON, and others, who ſeem to have known nothing of that audacious inſolence, with which theſe pontifs are ſaid to have oppoſed the emperors, and even repreſent them as having given ſeveral marks of their ſubmiſſion and obedience to the imperial authority. Such are the contrary accounts of the Greek and Latin writers; and the moſt prudent uſe we can make of them is, to ſuſpend our judgment with reſpect to a matter, which the obſcurity that covers the hiſtory of this period renders it impoſſible to clear up. All that we can know with certainty is, that the zeal of the two pontifs above mentioned for the worſhip of images, furniſhed to the people of *Italy* the occaſion of falling from their allegiance to the Grecian emperors.

☞ [*t*] This nick-name was given to CONSTANTINE, from his having defiled the ſacred font at his baptiſm.

aſſembly,

assembly, which the Greeks regard as the *seventh œcumenical council*, gave judgment, as was the custom of those times, in favour of the opinion embraced by the emperor, and solemnly condemned the worship and also the use of images [*u*]. But this decision was not sufficient to vanquish the blind obstinacy of superstition; many adhered still to their idolatrous worship, and none made a more turbulent resistance to the wise decree of this council than the monks, who still continued to excite commotions in the state, and to blow the flames of sedition and rebellion among the people. Their malignity was, however, chastised by CONSTANTINE, who, filled with a just indignation at their seditious practices, punished several of them in an exemplary manner, and by new laws set bounds to the violence of monastic rage. LEO IV. who, after the death of CONSTANTINE, was declared emperor A. D. 775, adopted the sentiments of his father and grandfather, and pursued the measures which they had concerted for the extirpation of idolatry out of the Christian church; for having perceived that the worshippers of images could not be engaged by mild and gentle proceedings to abandon this superstitious practice, he had recourse to the coercive influence of penal laws.

XIII. A cup of poison, administered by the impious counsel of a perfidious spouse, deprived LEO IV. of his life A. D. 780, and rendered the idolatrous cause of images triumphant. The profligate IRENE, after having thus accomplished the death of her husband, held the reins of empire during the minority of her son CONSTANTINE; and, to establish her authority on more

Under Irene.

☞ [*u*] The authority of this council is not acknowledged by the Roman catholicks, no more than the obligation of the *second commandment*, which they have *prudently* struck out of the decalogue.

solid

CENT. VIII. PART II.

ſolid foundations, entered into an alliance with ADRIAN, biſhop of *Rome*, A. D. 786, and ſummoned a council at *Nice* in *Bythinia*, which is known by the title of the *ſecond Nicene council*. In this aſſembly the imperial laws concerning the new idolatry were abrogated, the decrees of the council of *Conſtantinople* reverſed, the worſhip of images and of the croſs reſtored, and ſevere puniſhments denounced againſt ſuch as maintained that God was the only object of religious adoration. It is impoſſible to imagine any thing more ridiculous and trifling than the arguments upon which the biſhops, aſſembled in this council, founded their decrees [*w*]. The authority, however, of theſe decrees was held ſacred by the Romans, and the Greeks conſidered in the light of parricides and traitors all ſuch as refuſed to ſubmit to them. The other enormities of the flagitious IRENE, and her deſerved fate, cannot, with propriety, be treated of here.

The council of Francfort.

XIV. In theſe violent conteſts, the moſt of the Latins, ſuch as the Britons, Germans, and Gauls, ſeemed to ſteer a middle way between the oppoſite tenets of the contending parties. They were of opinion that images might be lawfully preſerved, and even placed in the churches, but, at the ſame time, they looked upon all worſhip of them as highly injurious and offenſive to the Supreme Being [*x*]. Such, particularly, were the ſentiments of CHARLEMAGNE, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this important controverſy. By the advice of the French biſhops, who were no friends to this ſecond council of *Nice*, he ordered ſome

[*w*] MART. CHEMNITIUS, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, par. iv. loc. ii. cap. v. p. 52. LENFANT, *Preſervatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de la Rome*, par. iii. lettre xvii. p. 446.

[*x*] The averſion the Britons had to the worſhip of images may be ſeen in SPELMAN *ad Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 73.

learned

learned and judicious divine to compoſe *Four Books concerning images*, which he ſent, in the year 790, to ADRIAN, the Roman pontif, with a view to engage him to withdraw his approbation of the decrees of that council. In this performance the reaſons alleged by the *Nicene* biſhops to juſtify the worſhip of images, are refuted with great accuracy and ſpirit [*y*]. They were not, however, left without defence; ADRIAN, who was afraid of acknowledging even an emperor for his maſter, compoſed an anſwer to the *Four Books* mentioned above, but neither his arguments, nor his authority, were ſufficient to ſupport the ſuperſtition he endeavoured to maintain; for, in the year 794, CHARLEMAGNE aſſembled, at *Francfort* on the *Maine*, a council of three hundred biſhops, in order to re-examine this important queſtion; in which the opinion contained in the *Four Books* was ſolemnly confirmed, and the worſhip of images unanimouſly condemned [*z*]. From hence we may conclude, that in this century the Latins

[*y*] The books of CHARLEMAGNE *concerning Images*, which deſerve an attentive peruſal, are yet extant; and when they were become extremely ſcarce, were republiſhed at *Hanover*, in 8vo, in 1731, by the celebrated CHRISTOPHER. AUG. HEUMAN, who enriched this edition with a learned Preface. Theſe books are adorned with the venerable name of CHARLEMAGNE; but it is eaſy to perceive that they are the production of a ſcholaſtic divine, and not of an emperor. Several learned men have conjectured, that CHARLEMAGNE compoſed theſe books with the aſſiſtance of his preceptor ALCUIN; ſee HEUMANNI *Præf.* p. 51. and BUNAU *Hiſtoria Imperii Germ.* tom. i. p. 490. This conjecture, though far from being contemptible, cannot be admitted without heſitation; ſince ALCUIN was in *England* when theſe books were compoſed. We learn from the hiſtory of his life, that he went into *England* A. D. 789, and did not return from thence before 792.

[*z*] This event is treated with a degree of candour not more laudable, than ſurpriſing, by MABILLON, in *Præf. ad Sæculum* iv. *Actorum SS. Ord. Benedict.* part V. See alſo Jo. GEORG. DORSCHEUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofordienſe*, *Argentor.* 1649, in 4to.

deemed

CENT. VIII. PART II.

deemed it neither impious, nor unlawful, to diſſent from the opinion of the Roman pontif, and even to charge that prelate with error.

The controverſy about the derivation of the Holy Ghoſt.

XV. While the controverſy concerning images was at its height, a new conteſt aroſe among the Latins and Greeks about the ſource from whence the Holy Ghoſt *proceeded*. The Latins affirmed, that this divine ſpirit proceeded from the father and the ſon; the Greeks, on the contrary, aſſerted, that it proceeded from the father only. The origin of this controverſy is covered with perplexity and doubt. It is, however, certain, that it was agitated in the council of *Gentilli*, near *Paris*, A. D. 767, in preſence of the emperor's legates [*a*], and from this we may conclude, with a high degree of probability, that it aroſe in *Greece* at that time when the conteſt about images was carried on with the greateſt vehemence. In this controverſy the Latins alleged, in favour of their opinion, the creed of *Conſtantinople*, which the Spaniards and French had ſucceſſively corrupted (upon what occaſion is not well known), by adding the words *filioque* in that part of it which contained the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghoſt. The Greeks, on the other hand, made loud complaints of this criminal attempt of the Latins to corrupt by a manifeſt interpolation a creed, which ſerved as a rule of doctrine for the church univerſal, and declared this attempt impudent and ſacrilegious. Thus the diſpute changed at length its object, and was transferred from the matter to the interpolated word above mentioned [*b*]: in the following century it was carried

[*a*] See LE COINTE *Annales Eccleſ. Francorum*, tom. v. p. 698.

[*b*] Learned men generally imagine that this controverſy began about the word *filioque*, which ſome of the Latins had added to the Creed that had been drawn up by the council of *Conſtantinople*,

carried on with ſtill greater vehemence, and added new fuel to the diſſenſions which already portended a ſchiſm between the eaſtern and weſtern churches [c]. CENT. VIII. PART II.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies multiplied.

I. THE religion of this century conſiſted almoſt entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies. We are not, therefore, to wonder that more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying and regulating theſe outward marks of a ſuperſtitious devotion, than in

Conſtantinople, and that from the *word* the diſpute proceeded to the *doctrine* itſelf; ſee MABILLON, *Act. Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* iv. par. I. *Præf.* p. iv. who is followed by many in this opinion. But this opinion is certainly erroneous. The doctrine was the firſt ſubject of controverſy, which afterwards extended to the word *filioque*, conſidered by the Greeks as a manifeſt interpolation. Among other proofs of this, the council of *Gentilli* ſhews evidently, that the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit had been, for a conſiderable time, the ſubject of controverſy, when the diſpute aroſe about the word now mentioned. PAGI, in his *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. p. 323, is of opinion, that this controverſy had both its date and its occaſion from the diſpute concerning images: for when the Latins treated the Greeks as heretics, on account of their oppoſition to image-worſhip, the Greeks, in their turn, charged the Latins alſo with hereſy, on account of their maintaining that the Holy Ghoſt proceeded from the father and the ſon. The learned critic has, however, advanced this opinion without ſufficient proof, and we muſt therefore conſider it as no more than a probable conjecture.

[c] See PITHOEI *Hiſt. controv. de proceſſione Spiritus S.* at the end of his *Codex Canon. Eccleſ. Roman.* p. 355. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. iii. p. 354. GER. J. VOSSIUS, *De Tribus Symbolis, Diſſ.* iii. p. 65: and above all, JO. GEORG. WALCHIUS, *Hiſtor. Controv. de Proceſſione Spiritus S.* publiſhed in 8vo, at *Jena*, in 1751.

correcting

CENT. VIII. PART II.

correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their underſtandings, and forming their hearts. The adminiſtration of the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, which was deemed the moſt ſolemn and important branch of divine worſhip, was now every where embelliſhed, or rather deformed, with a variety of ſenſeleſs fopperies, which deſtroyed the beautiful ſimplicity of that affecting and ſalutary inſtitution. We alſo find manifeſt traces in this century, of that ſuperſtitious cuſtom of celebrating what were called *ſolitary maſſes* [*d*], though it be difficult to decide whether they were inſtituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private perſons [*e*]. Be that as it may, this ſingle cuſtom is ſufficient to give us an idea of the ſuperſtition and darkneſs that ſat brooding over the Chriſtian church in this ignorant age, and renders it unneceſſary to enter into a further detail of the abſurd rites with which a deſigning prieſthood continued to diſfigure the religion of JESUS.

Charlemagne's zeal for the rites of the church of *Rome*.

II. CHARLEMAGNE ſeemed diſpoſed to ſtem this torrent of ſuperſtition, which gathered force from day to day; for not to mention the zeal with which he oppoſed the worſhip of images, there are other circumſtances that bear teſtimony to his intentions in this matter, ſuch as his preventing the multiplication of feſtivals, by reducing them to a fixed and limited number, his prohibiting the ceremony of conſecrating the

☞ [*d*] *Solitary* or *private maſſes* were thoſe that were celebrated by the prieſt alone in behalf of ſouls detained in purgatory, as well as upon ſome other particular occaſions. Theſe maſſes were prohibited by the laws of church, but they were a rich ſource of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a ſynod aſſembled at *Mentz* under CHARLEMAGNE, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and ſloth.

[*e*] See CHARLEMAGNE's book *concerning Images*, p. 245; as alſo GEORGE CALIXTUS, *De Miſſis Solitariis*, § 12.

church

church bells by the rite of holy aſperſion, and other eccleſiaſtical laws of his enacting, which redound to his honour. Several circumſtances, however, concurred to render his deſigns abortive, and to blaſt the ſucceſs of his worthy purpoſes, and none more than his exceſſive attachment to the Roman pontifs, who were the patrons and protectors of thoſe who exerted themſelves in the cauſe of ceremonies. This vehement paſſion for the lordly pontif was inherited by the great prince of whom we are now ſpeaking, from his father PEPIN, who had already commanded the manner of ſinging, and the kind of church-muſic in uſe at *Rome*, to be obſerved every where in all Chriſtian churches. It was in conformity with his example, and in compliance with the repeated and importunate ſolicitation of the pontif ADRIAN, that CHARLEMAGNE laboured to bring all the Latin churches to follow, as their model, the church of *Rome*, not only in the article now mentioned, but alſo in the whole form of their worſhip, in every circumſtance of their religious ſervice [*f*]. Several churches however, among which thoſe of *Milan* and *Corbetta* diſtinguiſhed themſelves eminently, abſolutely rejected this propoſal, and could neither be brought, by perſuaſion nor violence, to change their uſual method of worſhip.

[*f*] See CHARLEMAGNE's *Treatiſe concerning Images*, book I. p. 52. EGINARD, *De vita Caroli Magni*, cap. 26. p. 94. edit. *Beſſelii*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

CENT. VIII. PART II.

The ancient ſects recover ſtrength.

I. THE Arians, Manicheans, and Marcionites, though often depreſſed by the force of penal laws and the power of the ſecular arm, gathered ſtrength in the eaſt, amidſt the tumults and diviſions with which the Grecian empire was perpetually agitated, and drew great numbers into the profeſſion of their opinions [g]. The Monothelites, to whoſe cauſe the emperor PHILIPPICUS, and many others of the firſt rank and dignity were moſt zealous well-wiſhers, regained their credit in ſeveral places. The condition alſo of both the Neſtorians and Monophyſites was eaſy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; their power and influence was conſiderable; nor were they deſtitute of means of weakening the Greeks their irreconcilable adverſaries, and of ſpreading their doctrines, and multiplying every where the number of their adherents.

Clemens and Adalbert.

II. In the church which BONIFACE had newly erected in *Germany*, he himſelf tells us, that there were many perverſe and erroneous reprobates, who had no true notion of religion, and his friends and adherents confirm this aſſertion. But the teſtimony both of the one and the others is undoubtedly partial, and unworthy of credit; ſince it appears from the moſt evident proofs, that the perſons here accuſed of errors and hereſies were Iriſh and French divines, who refuſed that blind ſubmiſſion to the church of *Rome*, which BONIFACE was ſo zealous to propagate every where.

[g] In *Europe* alſo Arianiſm prevailed greatly among the barbarous nations that embraced the Chriſtian faith.

ADALBERT a Gaul, and CLEMENT a native of *Ireland*, were the perſons whoſe oppoſition gave the moſt trouble to the ambitious legate. The former got himſelf conſecrated biſhop without the conſent of BONIFACE, excited ſeditions and tumults among the eaſtern Francs, and appears, indeed, to have been both flagitious in his conduct and erroneous in his opinions; among other irregularities, he was the forger [*b*] of a letter to the human race, which was ſaid to have been written by JESUS CHRIST, and to have been carried from heaven by the arch-angel MICHAEL [*i*]. As to CLEMENT, his character and ſentiments were maliciouſly miſrepreſented, ſince it appears, by the beſt and moſt authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the true principles and doctrines of Chriſtianity than BONIFACE himſelf; and hence he is conſidered by many as a confeſſor and ſufferer for the truth in this barbarous age [*k*]. Be that as it will, both ADALBERT and CLEMENT were condemned, at the inſtigation of BONIFACE, by the pontif ZACHARY, in a council aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 748 [*l*], and in conſequence

[*b*] See the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 82.

[*i*] There is an edition of this letter publiſhed by the learned STEPHEN BALUZIUS, in the *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, tom. ii. p. 1396.

[*k*] We find an enumeration of the erroneous opinions of CLEMENT in the letters of BONIFACE *Epiſtol.* cxxxv. p. 189. See alſo USSERII *Sylloge Epiſtolarum Hibernicarum*, p. 12. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hiſtor. Critic.* tom. i. p. 133. ☞ The zealous BONIFACE was too ignorant to be a proper judge of hereſy, as appears by his condemning VIRGILIUS for believing that there were antipodes. The great hereſy of CLEMENT ſeems to have been his preferring the deciſions of ſcripture to decrees of councils and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God.

☞ [*l*] This is the true date of the council aſſembled by ZACHARY for the condemnation of ADALBERT and CLEMENT,

ſequence thereof were committed to priſon, where, in all probability, they concluded their days.

Felix and Elipand.

III. Religious diſcord ran ſtill higher in *Spain*, *France*, and *Germany*, towards the concluſion of this century; and the moſt unhappy tumults and commotions were occaſioned by a queſtion propoſed to FELIX biſhop of *Urgella*, by ELIPAND, archbiſhop of *Toledo*, who deſired to know *in what ſenſe* CHRIST *was* the ſon of God? The anſwer which the former gave to this queſtion, was, that CHRIST, conſidered in his divine nature, was *truly* and *eſſentially* the ſon of God; but that, conſidered as a man, he was only ſo, *nominally* and *by adoption*. This doctrine was ſpread abroad by the two prelates; ELIPAND propagated it in the different provinces of *Spain*, and FELIX throughout *Septimania*, while the pontif ADRIAN, and the greateſt part of the Latin doctors, looked upon this opinion as a renovation of the Neſtorian hereſy, by its repreſenting CHRIST as divided into two diſtinct perſons. In conſequence of this, FELIX was ſucceſſively condemned by the councils of *Narbonne*, *Ratiſbon*, *Francfort* on the *Maine*, and *Rome*; and was finally obliged, by the council of *Aix la-Chapelle*, to retract his error, and to change his opinion [*m*]. The change he made was, however, rather nominal than real, the

and not the year 745, as FLEURY * and MABILLON † have pretended, in which error they are followed by Mr. BOWER, in the third volume of his *Hiſtory of the Popes*, p. 325. The truth is, that the letter of BONIFACE, in conſequence of which this council was aſſembled, muſt have been wrote in the year 748; ſince he declares in that letter, that he had been near thirty years legate of the holy ſee of *Rome*, into which commiſſion he entered, as all authors agree, about the year 719.

☞ [*m*] The council of *Narbonne* that condemned FELIX, was held in the year 788, that of *Ratiſbon* in 792, that of *Francfort* in 794, that of *Rome* in 799.

* *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ix. p. 296. † *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* lib. xxii. n. 8.

common

common ſhift of temporiſing divines; for he ſtill retained his doctrine, and died in the firm belief of it at *Lyons*, where he had been baniſhed by CHARLEMAGNE [*n*]. ELIPAND, on the contrary, lived ſecure in *Spain* under the dominion of the Saracens, far removed from the thunder of ſynods and councils, and out of the reach of that coercive power in religious matters, whoſe utmoſt efforts can go no further than to make the erroneous, hypocrites or martyrs. Many are of opinion, that the diſciples of FELIX, who were called *Adoptians*, departed much leſs from the doctrine generally received among Chriſtians, than is commonly imagined; and that what chiefly diſtinguiſhed their tenets was the term they uſed, and their manner of expreſſion, rather than a real diverſity of ſentiments [*o*]. But as this ſect, together with their chief, thought proper to make uſe of ſingular, and ſometimes of contradictory, expreſſions; this furniſhed ſuch as accuſed them of Neſtorianiſm, with very plauſible reaſons to ſupport their charge.

CENT. VIII. PART II.

[*n*] The authors, who have written concerning the ſect of FELIX, are mentioned by J. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 482. Add to theſe PETRUS de MARCA, in his *Marca Hiſpanica*, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 368. Jo. de FERRERAS, *Hiſtoire Generale d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 518. 523. 528. 535. 560. Jo. MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, part ii. There are alſo very particular accounts given of FELIX by DOM. COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 70. and by the Benedictine monks in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 434.

[*o*] Jo. GEORGE DORSCHEUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofurt.* p. 101. WERENFELS, *De Logomachiis Eruditor.* p. 459. Opp. JAC. BASNAGIUS *Præf. ad Etherium in* HENR. CANISII *Lection. antiquis*, tom. ii. part I. p. 284. GEORGE CALIXTUS, *Singul. Diſſ.*

THE NINTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the church during this century.

CENT. IX. PART I.

The Swedes, Danes, and Cimbrians converted.

I. THE reign of CHARLEMAGNE had been ſingularly auſpicious to the Chriſtian cauſe; the life of that great prince was principally employed in the moſt zealous efforts to propagate and eſtabliſh the religion of JESUS among the Huns, Saxons, Frieſlanders, and other unenlightened nations; but his piety was mixed with violence, his ſpiritual conqueſts were generally made by the force of arms, and this impure mixture tarniſhes the luſtre of his nobleſt exploits. His ſon LEWIS, undeſervedly ſurnamed the MEEK, inherited the defects of his illuſtrious father without his virtues, and was his equal in violence and cruelty, but vaſtly his inferior in all worthy and valuable accompliſhments. Under his reign a very favourable opportunity was offered of propagating the goſpel among the northern nations, and particularly among the inhabitants of *Sweden* and *Denmark*. A petty king of *Jutland*, named HARALD KLACK, being driven from both his kingdoms

kingdom and country, in the year 826, by REGNER LODBROCK, threw himſelf at the emperor's feet, and implored his ſuccours againſt the uſurper. LEWIS granted his requeſt, and promiſed the exiled prince his protection and aſſiſtance, on condition, however, that he would embrace Chriſtianity, and admit the miniſters of that religion to preach in his dominions. HARALD ſubmitted to theſe conditions, was baptized with his brother at *Mentz*, A. D. 826, and returned into his country attended by two eminent divines, ANSGAR or ANSCHAIRE and AUTHBERT; the former a monk of *Corbey* in *Weſtphalia*, and the latter belonging to a monaſtery of the ſame name in *France*. Theſe venerable miſſionaries preached the goſpel with remarkable ſucceſs, during the ſpace of two years, to the inhabitants of *Cimbria* and *Jutland*.

The promotion and labours of Anſgar.

II. After the death of his learned and pious companion AUTHBERT, the zealous and indefatigable ANSGAR made a voyage into *Sweden*, A. D. 828, where his miniſterial labours were alſo crowned with a diſtinguiſhed ſucceſs. As he returned from thence into *Germany* in the year 831, he was loaded by LEWIS the MEEK with eccleſiaſtical honours, being created archbiſhop of the new church at *Hamburgh*, and alſo of the whole north, to which dignity the ſuperintendance of the church of *Bremen* was afterwards added in the year 844. The profits attached to this high and honourable charge were very inconſiderable; while the perils and labours, in which it involved the pious prelate, were truly formidable. Accordingly ANSGAR travelled frequently among the Danes, Cimbrians, and Swedes, in order to promote the cauſe of CHRIST, to form new churches, and to confirm and eſtabliſh thoſe which he had already gathered together; in all which arduous enterpriſes he paſſed his life in the moſt imminent

dangers, until he concluded his glorious courſe A. D. 865 [a].

Converſion of the Bulgarians, Bohemians, and Moravians.

III. About the middle of this century the Mœſians [b], Bulgarians, and Gazarians, and after them the Bohemians and Moravians, were converted to Chriſtianity by METHODIUS and CYRIL, two Greek monks, whom the empreſs THEODORA had ſent to diſpel the darkneſs of theſe idolatrous nations [c]. The zeal of CHARLEMAGNE, and his pious miſſionaries, had been formerly exerted in the ſame cauſe, and among the ſame people [d], but with ſo little ſucceſs, that any faint notions which they had received of the Chriſtian doctrine were entirely effaced. The inſtructions of the Grecian doctors had a much better, and alſo a more permanent effect; but as they recommended to their new diſciples the forms of worſhip, and the various rites and ceremonies uſed among the Greeks [e], this was the occaſion of much religious animoſity and conten-

[a] The writers to whom we are indebted for accounts of this pious and illuſtrious prelate, the founder of the Cimbrian, Daniſh, and Swediſh churches, are mentioned by Jo. ALBERT FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 292; as alſo in his *Lux Evangelii orbi terrarum exoriens*, p. 425. Add to theſe the Benedictine monks, in their *Hiſtoire Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 277. *Acta Sanctor. Menſ. Februar.* tom. i. p. 391. ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſ. Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. i. p. 18. Jo. MOLLERUS, *Cimbriæ Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 8. Theſe writers give us alſo circumſtantial accounts of EBBO, WITHMAR, REMBERT, and others, who were either the fellow-labourers or ſucceſſors of ANSGAR.

☞ [b] We have tranſlated thus the term *Myſi*, which is an error in the original. Dr. MOSHEIM, like many others, has confounded the Myſians with the inhabitants of *Mœſia*, by giving the latter, who were Europeans, the title of the former, who dwelt in *Aſia*.

[c] Jo. GEORGE STREDOWSKY, *Sacra Moraviæ Hiſtoria*, lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 94. compared with PET. KOHLII *Introduc. in Hiſtoriam et rem Litter. Slavorum*, p. 124.

[d] STREDOWSKY, *loc. cit.* lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55.

[e] LENFANT, *Hiſtoire de la guerre des Huſſites*, livr. i. ch. i. p. 2.

tion

tion in after-times, when the lordly pontifs exerted all their vehemence, and employed every means, though with imperfect ſucceſs, of reducing theſe nations under the diſcipline and juriſdiction of the Latin church.

IV. Under the reign of BASILIUS, the Macedonian, who aſcended the imperial throne of the Greeks in year 867, the Slavonians, Arentani, and certain provinces of *Dalmatia*, ſent a ſolemn embaſſy to *Conſtantinople* to declare their reſolution of ſubmitting to the juriſdiction of the Grecian empire, and of embracing, at the ſame time, the Chriſtian religion. This propoſal was received with admiration and joy, and it was alſo anſwered by a ſuitable ardour and zeal for the converſion of a people, which ſeemed ſo ingenuouſly diſpoſed to embrace the truth: accordingly, a competent number of Grecian doctors were ſent among them to inſtruct them in the knowledge of the goſpel, and to admit them by baptiſm into the Chriſtian church [*f*]. The warlike nation of the Ruſſians were converted under the ſame emperor, but not in the ſame manner, nor from the ſame noble and rational motives. Having entered into a treaty of peace with that prince, they were engaged by various preſents and promiſes to embrace the goſpel, in conſequence of which they received not only the Chriſtian miniſters that were appointed to inſtruct them, but alſo an archbiſhop, whom the Grecian patriarch IGNATIUS had ſent among them, to perfect their converſion and eſtabliſh their

Of the Slavonians and Ruſſians.

[*f*] We are indebted for this account of the converſion of the Slavonians to the treatiſe *De adminiſtrando imperio*, compoſed by the learned emperor CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGEN, which is publiſhed by BANDURIUS in *Imperium Orientale*, tom. i. p. 72, 73. CONSTANTINE gives the ſame account of this event in the life of his grandfather BASILIUS the Macedonian, § 54, publiſhed in the *Corpus Byzantinum*, tom. xvi. p. 133, 134.

church [*g*]. Such were the beginnings of Chriſtianity among the bold and warlike Ruſſians, who were inhabitants of the *Ukraine*, and who, a little before their converſion, fitted out a formidable fleet, and ſetting ſail from *Kiovia* for *Conſtantinople*, ſpread terror and diſmay through the whole empire [*h*].

The nature of theſe converſions.

V. It is proper to obſerve, with reſpect to the various converſions which we have now been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than thoſe of the preceding ages. The miniſters, who were now ſent to inſtruct and convert the barbarous nations, employed not, like many of their predeceſſors, the terror of penal laws, to affright men into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity; nor, in eſtabliſhing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally

[*g*] CONSTANTINUS *Porph. Vita Baſilii Macedonis*, § 96. p. 157. *Corp. Byzant.* See alſo the *Narratio de Ruthenorum Converſione*, publiſhed both in Greek and Latin by BANDURIUS, in his *Imperium Orientale, notis ad Porphyrogenetam de adminiſtrando imperio*, p. 62. tom. ii.

[*h*] The learned LEQUIEN, in his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1257, gives a very inaccurate account of theſe Ruſſians who were converted to Chriſtianity under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, and in this he does no more than adopt the errors of many who wrote before him upon the ſame ſubject. Nor is he conſiſtent with himſelf; for in one place he affirms, that the people here ſpoken of were the Ruſſians, that lived in the neighbourhood of the Bulgarians; while in another he maintains, that by theſe Ruſſians, we are to underſtand the Gazarians. The only reaſon he alleges to ſupport this latter opinion is, that among the Chriſtian doctors ſent to inſtruct the Ruſſians, mention is made of CYRIL, who converted the Gazari to Chriſtianity. This reaſon ſhews, that the learned writer had a moſt imperfect knowledge both of theſe Ruſſians and the Gazari. He is alſo guilty of other miſtakes upon the ſame ſubject. There is a much better explanation of this matter given by the very learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED. BAYER, *Diſſert. de Ruſſorum prima expeditione Conſtantinopolitana*, which is publiſhed in the ſixth volume of the *Commentaria Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitanæ*.

attentive

attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontifs: their views were more noble, and their conduct more ſuitable to the genius of the religion they profeſſed. They had principally in view the happineſs of mankind, endeavoured to promote the goſpel of truth and peace by methods of a rational perſuaſion, and ſeconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that the doctrine they taught was far from being conformable to that pure and excellent rule of faith and practice laid down by our divine Saviour, and his holy apoſtles; their religious ſyſtem was, on the contrary, corrupted with a variety of ſuperſtitious rites, and a multitude of abſurd inventions. It is further certain, that there remained among theſe converted nations too many traces of the idolatrous religion of their anceſtors, notwithſtanding the zealous labours of their Chriſtian guides; and it appears alſo, that theſe pious miſſionaries were contented with introducing an external profeſſion of the true religion among their new proſelytes. It would be, however, unjuſt to accuſe them on this account of negligence or corruption in the diſcharge of their miniſtry, ſince, in order to gain over theſe fierce and ſavage nations to the church, it may have been abſolutely neceſſary to indulge them in ſome of their infirmities and prejudices, and to connive at many things, which they could not approve, and which, in other circumſtances, they would have been careful to correct.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. IX PART I.

The progreſs of the Saracens towards univerſal empire.

I. THE Saracens had now extended their uſurpations with an amazing ſucceſs. Maſters of *Aſia*, a few provinces excepted, they puſhed their conqueſts to the extremities of *India*, and obliged the greateſt part of *Africa* to receive their yoke; nor were their enterpriſes in the weſt without effect, ſince *Spain* and *Sardinia* ſubmitted to their arms, and fell under their dominion. But their conqueſts did not end here: for in the year 827, by the treaſon of EUPHEMIUS, they made themſelves maſters of the rich and fertile iſland of *Sicily*; and towards the concluſion of this century the Aſiatic Saracens ſeized upon ſeveral cities of *Calabria*, and ſpread the terror of their victorious arms even to the very walls of *Rome*, while *Crete*, *Corſica*, and other adjacent iſlands, were either joined to their poſſeſſions, or laid waſte by their incurſions. It is eaſy to comprehend that this overgrown proſperity of a nation accuſtomed to bloodſhed and rapine, and which alſo beheld the Chriſtians with the utmoſt averſion, muſt have been every where detrimental to the progreſs of the goſpel, and to the tranquillity of the church. In the eaſt, more eſpecially, a prodigious number of Chriſtian families embraced the religion of their conquerors, that they might live in the peaceful enjoyment of their poſſeſſions. Many, indeed, refuſed this baſe and criminal compliance, and with a pious magnanimity adhered to their principles in the face of perſecution; but ſuch were gradually reduced to a miſerable condition, and were not only robbed of the beſt part of their wealth, and deprived of their

their worldly advantages, but, what was ſtill more deplorable, they fell by degrees into ſuch incredible ignorance and ſtupidity, that, in proceſs of time, there were ſcarcely any remains of Chriſtianity to be found among them beſides the mere name, and a few external rites and ceremonies. The European Saracens, particularly thoſe who were ſettled in *Spain*, were of a much milder diſpoſition, and ſeemed to have put off the greateſt part of their native ferocity; ſo that the Chriſtians, generally ſpeaking, lived peaceably under their dominion, and were permitted to obſerve the laws, and to enjoy the privileges of their holy profeſſion. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that this mild and tolerating conduct of the Saracens was not without ſome few exceptions of cruelty [*i*].

The Normans.

II. The European Chriſtians had the moſt cruel ſufferings to undergo from another quarter, even from the inſatiable fury of a ſwarm of barbarians that iſſued out from the northern provinces. The Normans, under which general term are comprehended the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, whoſe habitations lay along the coaſts of the Baltic ſea, were a people accuſtomed to carnage and rapine. Their petty kings and chiefs, who ſubſiſted by piracy and plunder, had already, during the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, infeſted with their fleets the coaſts of the German ocean, but were reſtrained by the oppoſition they met with from the vigilance and activity of that warlike prince. In this century, however, they became more bold and enterpriſing, made frequent irruptions into *Germany*, *Britain*, *Frieſland*, and the *Gauls*, and

[*i*] See, for example, the account that is given of EULOGIUS, who ſuffered martyrdom at *Cordoua*, in the *Acta Sanctorum ad d.* xi. *Martii*, tom. ii. p. 88; as alſo of RODERICK and SALOMON, two Spaniſh martyrs of this century. Ibid. *ad d.* xiii. *Martii*, p. 238.

carried

carried along with them, wherever they went, fire and ſword, deſolation and horror. The impetuous fury of theſe ſavage barbarians not only ſpread deſolation through the *Spaniſh* provinces [*k*], but even penetrated into the very heart of *Italy*; for in the year 857, they ſacked and pillaged the city of *Luca* in the moſt cruel manner, and about three years after *Piſa*, and ſeveral other cities of *Italy*, met with the ſame fate [*l*]. The ancient hiſtories of the Francs abound with the moſt diſmal accounts of their horrid exploits.

Form new ſettlements.

III. The firſt views of theſe ſavage invaders extended no further than plunder; but charmed at length with the beauty and fertility of the provinces, which they were ſo cruelly depopulating, they began to form ſettlements in them; nor were the European princes in a condition to oppoſe their uſurpations. On the contrary, CHARLES the BALD was obliged, in the year 850, to reſign a conſiderable part of his dominions to this powerful banditti [*m*]; and a few years after, under the reign of CHARLES the GROSS, emperor and king of *France*, the famous Norman chief GODOFRED entered with an army into *Frieſland*, and obſtinately refuſed to ſheath his ſword before he

[*k*] JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hiſtoire Gener. d' Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 583. Piracy was eſteemed among the northern nations a very honourable and noble profeſſion; and hence the ſons of kings, and the young nobility, were trained up to this ſpecies of robbery, and made it their principal buſineſs to perfect themſelves in it. Nor will this appear very ſurpriſing to ſuch as conſider the religion of theſe nations, and the barbariſm of the times. See JO. LUD. HOLBERG. *Hiſtoria Danorum et Norvegorum Navalis, in Scriptis Societatis Scientiar. Hafnienſis*, tom. iii. p. 349. in which there are a multitude of curious and intereſting relations concerning the ancient piracies, drawn from the Daniſh and Norwegian annals.

[*l*] See the *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, publiſhed by MURATORI.

[*m*] *Annales incerti Auctoris, in* PITHOEI *Scriptor. Francic.* p. 46.

was

was maſter of the whole province [*n*]. Such, however, of the Normans as ſettled among the Chriſtians, contracted a gentler turn of mind, and gradually departed from their primitive brutality. Their marriages with the Chriſtians contributed, no doubt, to civilize them; and engaged them to abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors with more facility, and to embrace the goſpel with more readineſs, than they would have otherwiſe done. Thus the proud conqueror of *Frieſland* ſolemnly embraced the Chriſtian religion after that he had received in marriage, from CHARLES the GROSS, GISELA, the daughter of LOTHAIRE the younger.

[*n*] REGINONIS PRUMIENSIS *Annal.* lib. ii. f. 60. in PISTORII *Scriptor. German.*

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

CENT. IX. PART II.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

THE Grecian empire, in this century, was in circumſtances every way proper to extinguiſh all taſte for letters and philoſophy, and all zeal for the cultivation of the ſciences. The liberality, however, of the emperors, ſome of whom were men of learning and taſte, and the wiſe precautions taken by the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, among whom PHOTIUS deſerves the firſt rank in point of erudition, contributed to attach a certain number of learned men to that imperial city, and thus prevented the total decline of letters. Accordingly we find in *Conſtantinople*, at this time, ſeveral perſons who excelled in eloquence and poetry; ſome who diſplayed, in their writings againſt the Latins, a conſiderable knowledge in the art of reaſoning, and a high degree of dexterity in the management of controverſy; and others who compoſed the hiſtory of their own times with accuracy and with elegance. The controverſy with the Latins, when it grew more keen and animated, contributed in a particular manner to excite the literary emulation of the diſputants, rendered them ſtudious to acquire new ideas, and a rich and copious elocution, adorned with the graces of elegance and wit; and thus rouzed and invigorated talents that were ready to periſh in indolence and ſloth.

II. We

Of philoſophy.

II. We learn from the accounts of ZONARAS, that the ſtudy of philoſophy lay for a long time neglected in this age; but it was revived, with a zeal for the ſciences in general, under the emperor THEOPHILUS, and his ſon MICHAEL III. This revival of letters was principally owing [o] to the encouragement and protection which the learned received from BARDAS, who had been declared CÆSAR, himſelf a weak and illiterate man, but a warm friend of the celebrated PHOTIUS, the great patron of ſcience, by whoſe counſel he was, undoubtedly, directed in this matter. At the head of all the learned men to whom BARDAS committed the culture of the ſciences, he placed LEO, ſurnamed the WISE, a man of the moſt profound and uncommon erudition, and who afterwards was conſecrated biſhop of *Theſſalonica*. PHOTIUS explained the *Categories* of ARISTOTLE, while MICHAEL PSELLUS gave a brief expoſition of the other works of that great philoſopher.

The ſtate of learning among the Arabians.

III. The Arabians, who, inſtead of cultivating the arts and ſciences, had thought of nothing hitherto but of extending their territories; were now excited to literary purſuits by ALMAMUNIS, otherwiſe called ABU GAAFAR ABDALLAH, whoſe zeal for the advancement of letters was great, and whoſe munificence towards men of learning and genius was truly royal. Under the auſpicious protection of this celebrated caliph of *Babylon* and *Egypt*, the Arabians made a rapid and aſtoniſhing progreſs in various kinds of learning. This excellent prince began to reign about the time of the death of CHARLEMAGNE, and died in the year 833. He erected the famous ſchools of *Bagdad*, *Cufa*, and *Baſora*, and eſtabliſhed ſeminaries of learning in ſeveral other cities; he drew to his court men of eminent parts by his extraordinary

[o] *Annalium*, tom. ii. lib. xvi. p. 126. tom. x. *Corporis Byzantin.*

libe-

liberality, ſet up noble libraries in various places, had tranſlations made of the beſt Grecian productions into the Arabic language at a vaſt expence, and employed every method of promoting the cauſe of learning, that became a great and generous prince, whoſe zeal for the ſciences was attended with knowledge [*p*]. It was under the reign of this immortal caliph, that the Arabians began to take pleaſure in the Grecian learning, and to propagate it, by degrees, not only in *Syria* and *Africa*, but alſo in *Spain* and *Italy*; and from this period they give us a long catalogue of celebrated philoſophers, phyſicians, aſtronomers, and mathematicians, who were ornaments to their nation through ſeveral ſucceeding ages [*q*]. And in this certainly they do not boaſt without reaſon; though we are not to conſider, as literally true, all the wonderful and pompous things which the more modern writers of the Saracen hiſtory tell us of theſe illuſtrious philoſophers.

After this period, the European Chriſtians profited much by the Arabian learning, and were highly indebted to the Saracens for the improvement they made in the various ſciences. For the mathematics, aſtronomy, phyſic, and philoſophy, that were taught in *Europe* from the tenth century, were, for the moſt part, drawn from the Arabian ſchools that were eſtabliſhed in *Spain* and *Italy*, or from the writings of the Arabian ſages. And from hence the Saracens may, in one reſpect, be juſtly conſidered as the reſtorers of learning in *Europe*.

The ſtate of letters under Charlemagne, and his ſucceſſors.

IV. In that part of *Europe*, that was ſubject to the dominion of the Franks, CHARLEMAGNE la-

[*p*] ABULPHARAIUS, *Hiſtoria Dynaſtiar.* p. 246. GEORG. ELMACIN. *Hiſtor. Saracen.* lib. ii. p. 139. BARTHOL. HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* Article MAMUN, p. 545.

[*q*] See the treatiſe of LEO AFRICANUS, *De Medicis et Philoſophis Arabibus*, publiſhed a ſecond time by FABRICIUS, in the twelfth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 259.

boured

boured with incredible zeal and ardour for the advancement of useful learning, and animated his subjects to the culture of the sciences in all their various branches. So that, had his successors been disposed to follow his example, and capable of acting upon the noble plan he formed, the empire, in a little time, would have been entirely delivered from barbarism and ignorance. It is true, this great prince left in his family a certain spirit of emulation, which animated his immediate successors to imitate, in some measure, his zeal for the prosperity of the republic of letters. LEWIS the MEEK both formed and executed several designs that were extremely conducive to the progress of the arts and sciences [r]; and his zeal, in this respect, was surpassed by the ardour with which his son CHARLES the BALD exerted himself in the propagation of letters, and in exciting the emulation of the learned by the most alluring marks of his protection and favour. This great patron of the sciences drew the *literati* to his court from all parts, took a particular delight in their conversation, multiplied and embellished the seminaries of learning, and protected, in a more especial manner, the Aulic school, of which mention has been formerly made, and which was first erected in the seventh century, in order to the education of the royal family, and the first nobility [s]. His brother LOTHAIRE endeavoured to revive in *Italy* the drooping sciences, and to restore them from that state of languor and decay into which the corruption and indolence of the clergy had permitted them to fall.

[r] See the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 583.

[s] HERMAN CONRINGII *Antiquit. Academicæ*, p. 320. CÆS. EG. DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 178. LAUNOIUS, *De Scholis Caroli M.* cap. xi, xii. p. 47. *Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 483.

CENT. IX. PART II.

For this purpoſe he erected ſchools in the eight principal cities of *Italy*, A. D. 823 [*t*], but with little ſucceſs, ſince it appears that that country was entirely deſtitute of men of learning and genius during the ninth century [*u*].

In *England* learning had a better fate under the auſpicious protection of king ALFRED, who has acquired an immortal name, not only by the admirable progreſs he made in all kinds of elegant and uſeful knowledge [*w*], but alſo by the care he took to multiply men of letters and genius in his dominions, and to reſtore to the ſciences, ſacred and profane, the credit and luſtre they ſo eminently deſerve [*x*].

Impediments to the progreſs of learning.

V. But the infelicity of the times rendered the effects of all this zeal and all theſe projects for the advancement of learning much leſs conſiderable than might have otherwiſe been expected. The

[*t*] See the edict for that purpoſe among the *Capitularia in* MURATORI *Rerum Italicar.* tom. i. part II. p. 151.

[*u*] See MURATORI's *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 829.

[*w*] See ANT. WOOD, *Hiſt. et Antiquit. Academ. Oxonienſ.* lib. i. p. 13. BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 211. *General Dictionary*, at the article ALFRED. (This prince, among other pious and learned labours, tranſlated the *Paſtoral of* GREGORY I. BOETIUS, *De Conſolatione*, and BEDE's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*.)

☞ [*x*] This excellent prince not only encouraged by his protection and liberality ſuch of his own ſubjects as made any progreſs in the liberal arts and ſciences, but invited over from foreign countries men of diſtinguiſhed talents, whom he fixed in a ſeminary at *Oxford*, and, of conſequence, may be looked upon as the founder of that noble univerſity. JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, who had been in the ſervice of CHARLES the BALD, and GRIMBALD, a monk of *St. Bertin* in *France*, were the moſt famous of thoſe learned men who came from abroad; ASSERIUS, WERFRID, PLEGMUND, DUNWUF, WULFSIG, and the abbot of *St. Neot's*, deſerve the firſt rank among the Engliſh *Literati*, who adorned the age of ALFRED. See COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, vol. I. book iii. p. 165, 166, &c. RAPIN THOYRAS, in the reign of this illuſtrious monarch.

pro-

protectors and patrons of the learned were themſelves learned; their authority was reſpectable, and their munificence was boundleſs; and yet the progreſs of ſcience towards perfection was but ſlow, becauſe the interruptions ariſing from the troubled ſtate of *Europe* were frequent. The diſcords that aroſe between LEWIS the MEEK and his ſons, which were ſucceeded by a rupture between the latter, retarded conſiderably the progreſs of letters in the empire; and the incurſions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted *Europe* during the whole courſe of this century, were ſo fatal to the culture of the arts and ſciences, that, in moſt of the European provinces, and even in *France*, there remained but a ſmall number who truly deſerved the title of learned men [*y*]. The wretched and incoherent fragments of erudition that yet remained among the clergy were confined to the monaſteries, and to the epiſcopal ſchools; but the zeal of the monkiſh and prieſtly orders for the improvement of the mind, and the culture of the ſciences, diminiſhed in proportion as their revenues increaſed, ſo that their indolence and ignorance grew with their poſſeſſions.

Examples of learned men who flouriſhed in this century.

VI. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that ſeveral examples of learned men, whoſe zeal for the ſciences was kindled by the encouragement and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, ſhone forth with a diſtinguiſhed luſtre through the darkneſs of this barbarous age. Among theſe, the firſt rank is due to RABANUS MAURUS, whoſe fame was great through all *Germany* and *France*, and to whom the youth reſorted, in prodigious numbers, from all parts, to receive his inſtructions in the liberal arts and ſciences. The writers of hiſtory, whoſe works have deſervedly preſerved their

[*y*] SERVATI LUPI *Epiſtolæ* xxxiv. p. 69. CONRINGII *Antiq. Acad.* p. 322. *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251.

CENT. IX. PART II.

names from oblivion, are EGINHARD, FRECULPH, THEGAN, HAMO, ANASTASIUS, ADO, and others of leſs note. FLORUS, WALAFRIDUS STRABO, BERTHARIUS, and RABANUS, excelled in poetry. SMARAGDUS and BERTHARIUS were eminent for their ſkill in grammar and languages, as was alſo the celebrated RABANUS already mentioned, who acquired a very high degree of reputation by a learned and ſubtile treatiſe concerning the cauſes and the riſe of languages. The Greek and Hebrew erudition was cultivated with conſiderable ſucceſs by WILLIAM, SERVATUS LUPUS, SCOTUS, and others. EGINHARD, AGOBARD, HINCMAR, and SERVATUS LUPUS, were much celebrated for the eloquence which appeared both in their diſcourſes and in their writings [z].

Johannes Scotus Erigena.

VII. The philoſophy and logic that were taught in the European ſchools during this century, ſcarcely deſerved ſuch honourable titles, and were little better than an empty jargon. There were, however, to be found in various places, particularly among the Iriſh, men of acute parts, and extenſive knowledge, who were perfectly well entitled to the appellation of philoſophers. The chief of theſe was JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA [a], a native of *Ireland*, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, who delighted ſo much in his converſation as to honour him with a place at his table. SCOTUS was endowed with an excel-

[z] Such as are deſirous of a more circumſtantial account of theſe writers, and of their various productions, may conſult the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251 to 271. Or the more ample account given of them by the celebrated LE BEUF, in his *Etat des Sciences en France depuis* CHARLEMAGNE *juſqu'au Roi* ROBERT, which is publiſhed in his *Recueil de divers ecrits pour ſervir d'Eclairciſſement à l'Hiſtoire de France*, tom. ii. p. 1. *Paris* 1738, en 8vo.

☞ [a] ERIGENA ſignifies properly a native of *Ireland*, as *Erin*, or *Irin*, was the ancient name of that kingdom.

lent

lent and truly ſuperior genius, and was conſiderably verſed both in Greek and Latin erudition. He explained to his diſciples the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, for which he was ſingularly well qualified by his thorough knowledge of the Greek language; but as his genius was too bold and aſpiring to confine itſelf to the authority and deciſions of the Stagirite, he puſhed his philoſophical reſearches yet farther, dared to think for himſelf, and ventured to purſue truth without any other guide than his own reaſon. We have yet extant of his compoſition, *Five books concerning the diviſion of nature*, an intricate and ſubtile production, in which the cauſes and principles of all things are inveſtigated with a conſiderable degree of ſagacity, and in which alſo the precepts of Chriſtianity are allegorically explained, yet in ſuch a manner as to ſhew, that their ultimate end is the union of the ſoul with the Supreme Being. He was the firſt who blended the *ſcholaſtic theology* with the *myſtic*, and formed them into one ſyſtem. It has alſo been imagined, that he was far from rejecting the opinions of thoſe who conſider the union of *God* and *nature*, as ſimilar to the union that ſubſiſts between the ſoul and the body, a notion much the ſame with that of many ancient philoſophers, who looked upon the Deity as the ſoul of the world. But it may, perhaps, be alleged, and not without reaſon, that what SCOTUS ſaid upon this ſubject amounted to no more than what the *Realiſts* [*b*], as they are called, maintained

☞ [*b*] The *Realiſts*, who followed the doctrine of ARISTOTLE with reſpect to *univerſal ideas*, were ſo called in oppoſition to the *Nominaliſts*, who embraced the hypotheſis of ZENO and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate ſubject. ARISTOTLE held, againſt PLATO, that previous to, and independent on, matter, there were no univerſal *ideas* or *eſſences*; and that the ideas or exemplars, which the latter ſuppoſed to have exiſted in the divine mind, and to have been the *models*

ed afterwards, though it must be allowed that he has expressed himself in a very perplexed and obscure manner [c]. This celebrated philosopher formed no particular sect, at least as far as is come to our knowledge; and this will be considered, by those who are acquainted with the spirit of the times he lived in, as a proof that his immense learning was accompanied with meekness and modesty.

About this time there lived a certain person named MACARIUS, a native of *Ireland*, who propagated in *France* that enormous error, which was afterwards adopted and professed by AVERROES, that one individual intelligence, one soul, performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race. This error was confuted by RATRAM, a famous monk of *Corbey* [d]. Before these writers flourished DUNGAL, a native of *Ireland* also, who left his country, and retired into a French monastery, where he lived during the reigns of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the MEEK, and taught philosophy and astronomy with the greatest reputation [e]. HERIC, a monk of *Aux-*

of all created things, had been eternally impressed upon matter, and were coeval with, and inherent in, their objects. ZENO and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, maintained that these pretended *universals* had neither *form* nor *essence*, and were no more than mere terms and *nominal* representations of their particular objects. The doctrine of ARISTOTLE prevailed until the eleventh century, when ROSCELINUS embraced the Stoical system, and founded the sect of the *Nominalists*, whose sentiments were propagated with great success by the famous ABELARD. These two sects differed considerably among themselves, and explained, or rather obscured, their respective tenets in a variety of ways.

[c] The work here alluded to was published at *Oxford*, by Mr. THOMAS GALE, in 1681. The learned HEUMAN has made several extracts from it, and given also an ample and learned account of SCOTUS, in his *Acts of the Philosophers*, written in *German*, tom. iii. p. 858.

[d] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* part II. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti.* § 156. p. 53.

[e] *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 493.

erre,

erre, made likewiſe an eminent figure among the learned of this age; he was a man of uncommon ſagacity, was endowed with a great and aſpiring genius, and is ſaid, in many things, to have anticipated the famous DESCARTES in the manner of inveſtigating truth [*f*].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. THE impiety and licentiouſneſs of the greateſt part of the clergy aroſe, at this time, to an enormous height, and ſtand upon record, in the unanimous complaints of the moſt candid and impartial writers of this century [*g*]. In the eaſt, tumult, diſcord, conſpiracies, and treaſon, reigned uncontrouled, and all things were carried by violence and force. Theſe abuſes appeared in many things, but particularly in the election of the patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*. The favour of the court was become the only ſtep to that high and important office; and as the patriarch's continuance in that eminent poſt depended upon ſuch an uncertain and precarious foundation, nothing was more uſual than to ſee a prelate pulled down from his epiſcopal throne by an imperial decree. In the weſtern provinces, the biſhops were become voluptuous and effeminate to a very high degree. They paſſed their lives amidſt the ſplendour of courts, and the plea-

[*f*] LE BEUF *Memoires pour l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 481. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iv. *M. Junii ad d.* xxiv. p 829. & *ad d.* xxxi. *Jul.* p. 249. For this philoſopher has obtained a place among the ſaintly order.

[*g*] See AGOBARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotii*, § 13. p. 137. tom. i. opp. ed. *Baluzii*.

CENT. IX. PART II.

ſures of a luxurious indoſence, which corrupted their taſte, extinguiſhed their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the ſolemn duties of their function [*h*]; while the inferior clergy were ſunk in licentiouſneſs, minded nothing but ſenſual gratifications, and infected with the moſt heinous vices the flock, whom it was the very buſineſs of their miniſtry to preſerve, or to deliver from the contagion of iniquity. Beſides, the ignorance of the ſacred order was, in many places, ſo deplorable, that few of them could either read or write; and ſtill fewer were capable of expreſſing their wretched notions with any degree of method or perſpicuity. Hence it happened, that when letters were to be penned, or any matter of conſequence was to be committed to writing, they had commonly recourſe to ſome perſon who was ſuppoſed to be endowed with ſuperior abilities, as appears in the caſe of SERVATUS LUPUS [*i*].

The cauſes of this corruption.

II. Many circumſtances concurred, particularly in the European nations, to produce and augment this corruption and licentiouſneſs, ſo ſhameful in an order of men, who were ſet apart to exhibit examples of piety to the reſt of the world. Among theſe we may reckon, as the chief ſources of the evil under conſideration, the calamities of the times, even the bloody and perpetual wars that were carried on between LEWIS the MEEK and his family, the incurſions and conqueſts of the barbarous nations, the groſs and

[*h*] The reader will be convinced of this by conſulting AGOBARD, *paſſim*, and by looking over the laws enacted in the Latin councils for reſtraining the diſorders of the clergy. See alſo SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epiſt.* xxxv. p. 73. 281. and STEPH. BALUZ. in *Advot.* p. 378.

[*i*] See the works of SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epiſt.* xcviii, xcix. p. 126. 142. 148. as alſo his *Life*. See alſo RODOLPHI *Bituricenſis Capitula ad clerum ſuum*, in BALUZII *Miſcellaneis*, tom. vi. p. 139. 148.

incre-

incredible ignorance of the nobility, and the affluence and riches that flowed in upon the churches and religious ſeminaries from all quarters. Many other cauſes alſo contributed to diſhonour the church, by introducing into it a corrupt miniſtry. A nobleman, who, through want of talents, activity, or courage, was rendered incapable of appearing with dignity in the cabinet, or with honour in the field, immediately turned his views towards the church, aimed at a diſtinguiſhed place among its chiefs and rulers, and became, in conſequence, a contagious example of ſtupidity and vice to the inferior clergy [*k*]. The patrons of churches, in whom reſided the right of election, unwilling to ſubmit their diſorderly conduct to the keen cenſure of zealous and upright paſtors, induſtriouſly looked for the moſt abject, ignorant and worthleſs eccleſiaſtics, to whom they committed the cure of ſouls [*l*]. But one of the circumſtances, which contributed in a particular manner to render, at leaſt, the higher clergy wicked and depraved, and to take off their minds from the duties of their ſtation, was the obligation they were under of performing certain ſervices to their ſovereigns, in conſequence of the poſſeſſions they derived from the royal bounty. The biſhops and heads of monaſteries held many lands and caſtles by a feudal tenure; and being thereby bound to furniſh their princes with a certain number of ſoldiers in time of war, were obliged alſo to take the field themſelves at the head of theſe troops [*m*],

[*k*] HINCMARUS, *Oper. Poſterior. contra Godeſchalcum*, cap. xxxvi. tom. i. Opp. p. 318. SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epiſt.* lxxix. p. 120.

[*l*] AGOBARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotum*, cap. xi. p. 341. tom. i. Opp.

[*m*] STEPH. BALUZII *Appendix Actor. ad Servatum*, p. 508. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 446. MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 587. FRESNE, *ad Joinvillii Hiſt. Ludovici S.* p. 75, 76.

and

CENT. IX. PART II.

and thus to act in a ſphere that was utterly inconſiſtent with the nature and duties of their ſacred character. Beſides all this, it often happened that rapacious princes, in order to ſatisfy the craving wants of their ſoldiers and domeſtics, boldly invaded the poſſeſſions of the church, which they diſtributed among their armies; in conſequence of which the prieſts and monks, in order to avoid periſhing through hunger, abandoned themſelves to the practice of violence, fraud, and all ſorts of crimes, which they looked upon as the only means, they had left, of procuring themſelves a ſubſiſtence [*n*].

The Roman pontifs.

III. The Roman pontifs were raiſed to that high dignity by the ſuffrages of the ſacerdotal order, accompanied by the voice of the people; but, after their election, the approbation of the emperor was neceſſary in order to their conſecration [*o*]. There is indeed, yet extant, an edict, ſuppoſed to have been publiſhed in the year 817, by LEWIS the MEEK, in which he aboliſhes this imperial right, and grants to the Romans, not only the power of electing their pontif, but alſo the privilege of inſtalling and conſecrating him when elected, without waiting for the conſent of the emperor [*p*]. But this grant will deceive none who enquire into this matter with any degree of attention and diligence, ſince

[*n*] AGOBARDUS, *De diſpenſ. rerum Eccleſiaſt.* § 4, p. 270. tom. i. Opp. FLODOARDUS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Rhemenſis*, lib. iii. cap. ix. SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epiſt.* xlv. p. 87. 437, &c. MURATORI, tom. vi. *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, p. 302. LUD. THOMASSIN, *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ vet. et novæ circa beneficia*, part II. lib. iii. cap. xi. Theſe corrupt meaſures prevailed alſo among the Greeks and Lombards, as may be ſeen in the *Oriens Chriſtianus* of LEQUIEN, tom. i. p. 142.

[*o*] See DE BUNAU, *Hiſtor. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 28. 32.

[*p*] HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iv. p. 1236. LE COINTE, *Annales Eccleſ. Francor.* tom. vii. *ad A.* 817. § 6. BALUZII *Capitular. Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 591.

ſeveral

ſeveral learned men have proved it ſpurious by the moſt irreſiſtible arguments [q]. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that, after the time of CHARLES the BALD, a new ſcene of things aroſe; and the important change above mentioned was really introduced. That prince having obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the biſhop of *Rome*, returned this eminent ſervice by delivering the ſucceeding pontifs from the obligation of waiting for the conſent of the emperors, in order to their being inſtalled in their office. And thus we find, that from the time of EUGENIUS III. who was raiſed to the pontificate A. D. 884. the election of the biſhops of *Rome* was carried on without the leaſt regard to law, order, and decency, and was generally attended with civil tumults and diſſenſions, until the reign of OTHO the GREAT, who put a ſtop to theſe diſorderly proceedings.

The frauds practiſed by the Roman pontifs to increaſe their power.

IV. Among the prelates that were raiſed to the pontificate, in this century, there were very few who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their learning, prudence, and virtue, or who were at all careful about acquiring thoſe particular qualities that are eſſential to the character of a Chriſtian biſhop. On the contrary, the greateſt part of them are only known by the flagitious actions that have tranſmitted their names with infamy to our times; and they all, in general, ſeem to have vied with each other in their ambitious efforts to extend their authority, and render their dominion unlimited and univerſal. It is here that we may place, with propriety, an event, which is ſaid to

[q] MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſt.* p. 54. and *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 29, 30. in which that learned man conjectures, that this edict was forged in the eleventh century. BUNAU, *Hiſt. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 34. The partiſans, however, of the papal authority, ſuch as Fontanani and others, plead ſtrenuouſly, though ineffectually, for the authenticity of the edict in queſtion.

have

have interrupted the much vaunted ſucceſſion of regular biſhops in the ſee of *Rome*, from the firſt foundation of that church to the preſent times. Between the pontificate of LEO IV. who died in the year 855, and that of BENEDICT III. a certain woman, who had the art to diſguiſe her ſex for a conſiderable time, is ſaid, by learning, genius, and dexterity, to have made good her way to the papal chair, and to have governed the church with the title and dignity of pontif about two years. This extraordinary perſon is yet known by the title of POPE JOAN. During the five ſucceeding centuries this event was generally believed, and a vaſt number of writers bore teſtimony to its truth; nor, before the reformation undertaken by LUTHER, was it conſidered by any, either as incredible in itſelf, or as ignominious to the church [r]. But in the laſt century, the elevation, and indeed the exiſtence, of this female pontif, became the ſubject of a keen and learned controverſy; and ſeveral men of diſtinguiſhed abilities both among the Roman catholics and proteſtants, employed all the force of their genius and erudition to deſtroy the credit of this ſtory, by invalidating, on the one hand, the weight of the teſtimonies on which it is founded, and by ſhewing, on the other, that it was inconſiſtent with the moſt accurate chronological computations [s]. Between the contending parties, ſome of

[r] The arguments of thoſe who maintain the truth of this extraordinary event are collected in one ſtriking point of view, with great learning and induſtry, by FRED. SPANHEIM, in his *Exercitatio de Papa Fœmina*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 577. This diſſertation was tranſlated into French by the celebrated L'ENFANT, who digeſted it into a better method, and enriched it with ſeveral additions.

[s] The arguments of thoſe who reject the ſtory of POPE JOAN as a fable, have been collected by DAVID BLONDEL, and after him with ſtill more art and erudition by BAYLE, in the

of the wiſeſt and moſt learned writers have judiciouſly ſteered a middle courſe: they grant that many fictitious and fabulous circumſtances have been interwoven with this ſtory; but they deny that it is entirely deſtitute of all foundation, or that the controverſy is yet ended, in a ſatisfactory manner, in favour of thoſe who diſpute the truth. And, indeed, upon a deliberate and impartial view of this whole matter, it will appear more than probable, that ſome unuſual event muſt have happened at *Rome*, from which this ſtory derived its origin; becauſe it is not at all credible, from any principles of moral evidence, that an event ſhould be univerſally believed and related in the ſame manner by a multitude of hiſtorians, during five centuries immediately ſucceeding its ſuppoſed date, if that event was abſolutely deſtitute of all foundation. But what it was that gave riſe to this ſtory is yet to be diſcovered, and is likely to remain ſo [*t*].

V. The

the third volume of his *Dictionary*, at the article PAPESSE. Add to this Jo. GEORG. ECCARD, *Hiſtor. Franciæ Oriental.* tom. ii. lib. xxx. § 119. p. 436, which author has adopted and appropriated the ſentiments of the great LEIBNITZ, upon the matter in queſtion. See alſo LEQUIEN's *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. iii. p. 777. and HEUMAN's *Sylloge Diſſert. Sacr.* tom. i. part II. p. 352. The very learned Jo. CHRISTOPH. WAGENSELIUS has given a juſt and accurate view of the arguments on both ſides, which may be ſeen in the *Amœnitates Litterariæ* of SCHELHORNIUS, part I. p. 146. and the ſame has been done by BASNAGE, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 408. A liſt of the other writers, who have employed their labours upon this intricate queſtion, may be ſeen in CASP. SAGITTARIUS's *Introd. in Hiſt. Eccleſ.* tom. i. cap. xxv. p. 676. and in the *Biblioth. Bremenſ.* tom. viii. part V. p. 935.

[*t*] Such is the opinion of PAUL SARPI, in his *Lettere Italiane*, Lett. lxxxii. p. 452; of LENFANT *Biblioth. Germanique*, tom. x. p. 27; of THEOD. HASÆUS, *Biblioth. Bremenſ.* tom. viii. part V. p. 935: and of the celebrated PFAFF *Inſtit. Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* p. 402; to whom we might add WERNSDORFF, BOECLER, HOLBERG, and many others, were this enumeration

CENT. IX. PART II.

Their zealous attachment to the kings of *France*, by whom they are favoured.

V. The enormous vices, that muſt have covered ſo many pontifs with infamy in the judgment of the wiſe, formed not the leaſt obſtacle to their ambition in theſe miſerable times, nor hindered them from extending their influence, and augmenting their authority, both in church and ſtate. It does not, indeed, appear from any authentic records, that their poſſeſſions augmented in proportion to the progreſs of their authority, nor that any new grants of land were added to what they had already obtained from the liberality of the kings of *France*. The donations, which LEWIS the MEEK is reported to have made to them, are mere inventions, equally deſtitute of truth and probability [*u*]; and nothing is more groundleſs than the accounts of thoſe writers who affirm that CHARLES the BALD diveſted himſelf, in the year 875, of his right to the city of *Rome*, and its territory, in favour of the pontifs, whom he, at the ſame time, enriched with a variety of noble and coſtly preſents, in return for the good ſervices of JOHN VIII. by whoſe ſuccours he was raiſed to the empire. But be that as it may, it is certain, that the authority and affluence of the biſhops of *Rome* increaſed greatly from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, but more eſpecially from the acceſſion of CHARLES the BALD to the imperial throne, as all the hiſtorical records of that period abundantly teſtify [*w*].

They gain by the troubles that ariſe in the empire.

VI. After the death of LEWIS II. a fierce and dreadful war broke out between the poſterity of

ration neceſſary. Without aſſuming the character of a judge in this intricate controverſy, concerning which ſo many falſe deciſions have been pronounced, I ſhall only take the liberty to obſerve, that the matter in debate is as yet dubious, and has not, on either ſide, been repreſented in ſuch a light as to bring conviction.

[*u*] See above, § 3.

[*w*] BUNAU *Hiſtor. Imperii Rom. German.* tom. ii. p. 482. Jo. GEORGE ECCARD, *Hiſtor. Franciæ Orient.* tom. ii. lib. xxxi. p. 606.

CHAR-

CHARLEMAGNE, among which there were ſeveral competitors for the empire. This furniſhed the Italian princes, and the Roman pontif JOHN VIII. with a favourable opportunity of aſſuming to themſelves the right of nominating to the imperial throne, and of excluding from all part in this election the nations who had formerly the right of ſuffrage; and if the opportunity was favourable, it was ſeized with avidity, and improved with the utmoſt dexterity and zeal. Their favour and intereſt was earneſtly ſolicited by CHARLES the BALD, whoſe intreaties were rendered effectual by rich preſents, prodigious ſums of money, and moſt pompous promiſes, in conſequence of which he was proclaimed, A. D. 876, by the pontif JOHN VIII. and by the Italian princes aſſembled at *Pavia*, king of *Italy* and emperor of the Romans. CARLOMAN and CHARLES the GROSS, who ſucceeded him in the kingdom of *Italy*, and in the Roman empire, were alſo elected by the Roman pontif, and the Italian princes. After the reigns of theſe princes the empire was torn in pieces; the moſt deplorable tumults and commotions aroſe in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, which were governed, or rather ſubdued and uſurped, by various chiefs, and in this confuſed ſcene of things, the higheſt bidder was, by the ſuccour of the greedy pontifs, generally raiſed to the government of *Italy*, and to the imperial throne [*x*].

VII. Thus the power and influence of the pontifs, in civil affairs, aroſe in a ſhort time to an enormous height through the favour and protection of the princes, in whoſe cauſe they had employed the influence which ſuperſtition had given them over the minds of the people. The increaſe of their authority, in religious matters, was not

The emperors diveſted of their eccleſiaſtical authority, and the power of the councils and of the biſhops diminiſhed.

[*x*] This matter is amply illuſtrated by SIGONIUS, in his famous book *De Regno Italiæ*, and by the other writers of German and Italian hiſtory.

leſs

CENT. IX. PART II.

leſs rapid, nor leſs conſiderable, and it aroſe from the ſame cauſes. The wiſeſt and moſt impartial among the Roman Catholic writers not only acknowledge, but are even at pains to demonſtrate, that, from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, the ancient rules of eccleſiaſtical government were gradually changed in *Europe*, by the counſels and inſtigation of the court of *Rome*, and new laws ſubſtituted in their place. The European princes ſuffered themſelves to be diveſted of the ſupreme authority in religious matters, which they had derived from CHARLEMAGNE; the power of the biſhops was greatly diminiſhed, and even the authority of both provincial and general councils began to decline. The Roman pontifs, elated with their overgrown proſperity, and become arrogant, beyond meaſure, by the daily acceſſions that were made to their authority, were eagerly bent upon perſuading all, and had, indeed, the good fortune to perſuade many, that the biſhop of *Rome* was conſtituted and appointed by JESUS CHRIST, ſupreme legiſlator and judge of the church univerſal; and that, therefore, the biſhops derived all their authority from the Roman pontif, nor could the councils determine any thing without his permiſſion and conſent [*y*]. This opinion, which was inculcated by the pontifs with the utmoſt zeal and ardour, was oppoſed by ſuch as were acquainted with the ancient eccleſiaſtical conſtitutions, and the government of the church in the earlier ages; but it was oppoſed in vain.

[*y*] See the excellent work of an anonymous and unknown author, who ſigns himſelf D. B. and whoſe book is intitled *Hiſtoire du Droit Eccleſiaſtique public Francois*, publiſhed firſt at *London*, in two volumes 8vo, in the year 1737, and lately republiſhed in a larger and more ſplendid edition. The author of this performance ſhews, in a judicious and conciſe manner, the various ſteps by which the papal authority aroſe to ſuch a monſtrous height. His account of the ninth century may be ſeen in the firſt volume of his work, at the 160th page.

VIII. In

VIII. In order to gain credit to this new eccleſiaſtical ſyſtem, ſo different from the ancient rules of church government, and to ſupport the haughty pretenſions of the pontifs to ſupremacy and independence, it was neceſſary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to ſtop the mouths of ſuch as were diſpoſed to ſet bounds to their uſurpations. The biſhops of *Rome* were aware of this; and as thoſe means were looked upon as the moſt lawful that tended beſt to the accompliſhment of their purpoſes, they employed ſome of their moſt ingenious and zealous partizans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epiſtles, and ſuch like records, by which it might appear, that, in the firſt ages of the church, the Roman pontifs were cloathed with the ſame ſpiritual majeſty and ſupreme authority which they now aſſumed [z]. Among theſe fictitious ſupports of the papal dignity, the famous *decretal Epiſtles*, as they are called, ſaid to have been written by the pontifs of the primitive times, deſerve chiefly to be ſtigmatized. They were the production of an obſcure writer, who fraudulently prefixed to them

Forged memorials and acts procured by the pontifs to eſtabliſh their ſupremacy.

Decretals.

[z] There is juſt reaſon to imagine, that theſe *Decretals*, and various other acts; ſuch as the grants of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the MEEK, were forged with the knowledge and conſent of the Roman pontifs; ſince it is utterly incredible, that theſe pontifs ſhould, for many ages, have conſtantly appealed, in ſupport of their pretended rights and privileges, to acts and records that were only the fictions of private perſons, and ſhould, with ſuch weak arms, have ſtood out againſt kings, princes, councils, and biſhops, who were unwilling to receive their yoke. Acts of a private nature would have been uſeleſs here, and public deeds were neceſſary to accompliſh the views of papal ambition. Such forgeries were, in this century, eſteemed lawful, on account of their ſuppoſed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance the proſperity of the church: and, therefore, it is not ſurprizing, that the *good* pontifs ſhould feel no remorſe in impoſing upon the world frauds and forgeries, that were deſigned to enrich the patrimony of St. PETER; and to aggrandize his ſucceſſors in the apoſtolic ſee.

the name of ISIDORE, biſhop of *Seville* [*a*], to make the world believe they had been collected by that illuſtrious and learned prelate. Some of them had appeared in the eighth century [*b*], but they were now entirely drawn from their obſcurity, and produced, with an air of oſtentation and triumph, to demonſtrate the ſupremacy of the Roman pontifs [*c*]. The deciſions of a certain Roman council, which is ſaid to have been held during the pontificate of SYLVESTER, were likewiſe alleged in behalf of the ſame cauſe; but this council had never been ſo much as heard of before the preſent century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the ſame ſource with the *decretals*, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandize the

[*a*] It is certain that the forger of the *decretals* was extremely deſirous of perſuading the world, that they were collected by ISIDORE, the celebrated biſhop of *Seville*, who lived in the ſixth century. See FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 561. It was a cuſtom among the biſhops to add, from a principle of humility, the epithet *Peccator*, i. e. *Sinner*, to their titles; and, accordingly, the forger of the *Decretals* has added the word *Peccator* after the name of ISIDORE; but this ſome ignorant tranſcribers have abſurdly changed into the word *Mercator*; and hence it happens, that one ISIDORUS MERCATOR paſſes for the fraudulent collector, or forger of the *decretals*.

[*b*] See DON CALMET, *Hiſtoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 528. B. JUST. HEN. BOHMER. *Præf. ad novum Edit. Juris Canon.* tom. i. p. x. xix. *Not.*

[*c*] Beſide the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenſes* and other writers, the learned BLONDEL has demonſtrated, in an ample and ſatisfactory manner, the ſpuriouſneſs of the *decretals*, in his *Pſeudo-Iſidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*; and in our time the cheat is acknowledged even by the Roman Catholics, at leaſt by ſuch of them as are poſſeſſed of any tolerable degree of judgment and impartiality. See BUDDEUS's *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 762; as alſo PETR. COUSTANTIUS's *Prolegom. ad Epiſtolas Pontificum*, tom. i. p. 130; and a *Diſſertation of* FLEURY, prefixed to the ſixteenth volume of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*.

Roman

Roman pontifs, and exalt them above all human authority and juriſdiction [*d*].

The ſucceſs of theſe frauds.

IX. There were not, however, wanting among the Latin biſhops men of prudence and ſagacity, who ſaw through theſe impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French biſhops diſtinguiſhed themſelves, in a particular and glorious manner, by the zeal and vehemence with which they oppoſed the ſpurious *decretals*, and other like fictitious monuments and records, and proteſted againſt their being received among the laws of the church. But the obſtinacy of the pontifs, and particularly of NICHOLAS I., conquered this oppoſition, and reduced it to ſilence. And as the empire, in the periods that ſucceeded this conteſt, fell back into the groſſeſt ignorance and darkneſs, there ſcarcely remained any who were capable of detecting theſe odious impoſtors, or diſpoſed to ſupport the expiring liberty of the church. The hiſtory of the following ages ſhews, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the diſorders and calamities that ſprung from the ambition of the aſpiring pontifs; it repreſents theſe deſpotic lords of the church, labouring by the aid of their impious frauds to overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its biſhops, to engroſs its riches and revenues into their own hands; nay, what is ſtill more horrible, it repreſents them aiming perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to leſſen their power, and to ſet bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimouſly acknowledged by ſuch as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the hiſtory of the times of which we now write, and is

[*d*] See Jo. LAUNOIUS, *De cura Eccleſiæ erga pauperes et miſeros*, cap. i. Obſervat. i. p. 576. tom. ii. part II. Opp.

ingenuouſly confeſſed by men of learning and probity, that are well affected to the Romiſh church and its ſovereign pontif [*e*].

The monaſtic life in high repute.

X. The monaſtic life was now univerſally in the higheſt eſteem, and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid to ſuch as devoted themſelves to the ſacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accuſtomed to regard the monkiſh orders and diſcipline with the greateſt admiration; but it was only ſince the beginning of the laſt century, that this holy paſſion was indulged among the Latins to ſuch an extravagant length. In the preſent age it went beyond all bounds: kings, dukes, and counts, forgot their true dignity, even the fulfilling with zeal the duties of their high ſtations, and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they took for magnanimity, though it was really nothing elſe but the reſult of a narrow and ſuperſtitious ſpirit. They abandoned their thrones, their honours, and their treaſures, and ſhut themſelves up in monaſteries with a view of devoting themſelves entirely to God. Several examples of this fanatical extravagance were exhibited in *Italy*, *France*, *Germany*, and *Spain*, both in this and the preceding century. And if the allurements of worldly pleaſures and honours had too much power over the minds of many, to permit their ſeparating themſelves from human ſociety, during their lives, ſuch endeavoured to make amends for this in their laſt hours; for when they perceived death approaching, they demanded the monaſtic habit, and actually put it on before their departure, that they

[*e*] See the abovementioned author's treatiſe, intitled *Regia Poteſtas in Cauſis Matrimonial.* tom. i. part II. Opp. p. 764; as alſo PETR. COUSTANTIUS, *Præf. ad Epiſt. Romanor. Pontif.* tom. i. p. 127.

might

might be regarded as of the fraternity, and be of consequence entitled to the fervent prayers and other ſpiritual ſuccours of their ghoſtly brethren.

Monks and abbots employed in civil affairs, and called to the courts of princes.

But nothing affords ſuch a ſtriking and remarkable proof of the exceſſive and fanatical veneration that was paid to the Monaſtic order, as the treatment they received from ſeveral kings and emperors, who drew numbers of monks and abbots from their cloiſters, and placed them in ſtations entirely foreign to their vows and their character, even amidſt the ſplendour of a court, and at the head of affairs. The tranſition, indeed, was violent from the obſcurity of a convent and the ſtudy of a liturgy, to ſit at the helm of an empire, and manage the political intereſts of nations. But ſuch was the caſe; and pious princes alleged as a reaſon for this ſingular choice, that the government of a ſtate could never be better placed than in the hands of ſuch holy men, who had ſubdued all irregular appetites and paſſions, and were ſo diveſted of the luſt of pleaſure and ambition, as to be incapable of any unworthy deſigns, any low, ſordid, or ſelfiſh views. Hence we find in the hiſtory of theſe times frequent examples of monks and abbots performing the functions of ambaſſadors, envoys, and miniſters of ſtate, and diſplaying their talents with various ſucceſs in theſe high and eminent ſtations.

A reformation of the monaſtic order attempted.

XI. The morals, however, of the monks, were far from being ſo pure as to juſtify the reaſon alleged above for their promotion. Their patrons and protectors, who loaded them with honours and preferment, were ſenſible of the irregular and licentious lives that many of them led, and uſed their utmoſt efforts to correct their vices, and to reform their manners. LEWIS the MEEK diſtinguiſhed his zeal in the execution of this virtuous and noble deſign; and, to render it more effectual, he employed the pious labours of BENEDICT,

CENT. IX. PART II.

DICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in reforming the monaſteries firſt in *Aquitaine*, and afterwards throughout the whole kingdom of *France*, and in reſtoring, by new and ſalutary laws, the monaſtic diſcipline, which was abſolutely neglected and fallen into decay. This worthy eccleſiaſtic preſided, in the year 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, where ſeveral wiſe meaſures were taken for removing the diſorders that reigned in the cloiſters; and in conſequence of the unlimited authority he had received from the emperor, he ſubjected all the monks, without exception, to the rule of the famous BENEDICT abbot of *Mount Caſſin*; annulled that variety of rites and cuſtoms that had obtained in the different monaſteries, preſcribed to them all one uniform method of living, and thus united, as it were, into one general body or ſociety, the various orders which had hitherto been connected by no common bond [*f*]. This admirable diſcipline, which acquired to BENEDICT of *Aniane* the higheſt reputation, and made him be revered as the ſecond father of the weſtern monks, flouriſhed during a certain time, but afterwards declined through various cauſes, until the concluſion of this century, when, under the calamities that oppreſſed both the church and the empire, it almoſt entirely diſappeared.

Canons and canoneſſes.

XII. The ſame emperor, who had appeared with ſuch zeal both in protecting and reforming the monks, gave alſo diſtinguiſhed marks of his favour to the order of *canons*, which CHRODEGANGUS had introduced in ſeveral places during

[*f*] Jo. MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* iv. part I. *Præf.* p. xxvii. and *Præf. ad Sæc.* v. p. xxv. EJUSDEM, *Annales Ordin. S. Benedict.* tom. ii. 430. CALMET, *Hiſt. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 596. For a particular account of BENEDICT of *Aniane*, and his illuſtrious virtues, ſee the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Febr.* p. 606: and the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 447.

the

the laſt century. He diſtributed them through all the provinces of the empire, and inſtituted alſo an order of *canoneſſes*, which was the firſt female convent known in the Chriſtian world [*g*]. For each of theſe orders the zealous emperor had a rule drawn up A. D. 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, which he ſubſtituted in the place of that which had been appointed by CHRODEGANGUS, and this new rule was obſerved in moſt of the monaſteries and convents of the canons and canoneſſes in the weſt until the twelfth century, notwithſtanding that it was diſapproved of by the court of *Rome* [*h*]. The author of the rule that was appointed for the *canons* was, undoubtedly, AMALARIUS, a preſbyter of *Metz*; but it is not ſo certain whether that which was drawn up for the *canoneſſes* was compoſed by the ſame hand [*i*]. Be that as it may, the *canonical* order grew into

[*g*] See MABILLON, *Annal. Ordin. S. Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 428.

[*h*] This rule was condemned in a council held at *Rome*, A. D. 1059, under the pontif NICHOLAS II. The pretexts uſed by the pontif and the aſſembled prelates, to juſtify their diſapprobation of this rule, were, that it permitted the canons to enjoy the poſſeſſions they had before their vows, and allowed to each of them too large a portion of bread and wine; but the true reaſon was, that this order had been inſtituted by an emperor without either the conſent, or knowledge, of the Roman pontif. For an account of the rule and diſcipline of theſe *canons*, ſee FLEURY's *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* tom. x. p. 163, 164, &c. *Bruſſels* edition in 12mo.

[*i*] LUD. THOMASSIN, *Diſciplin. Eccleſ. Vet. et Novæ*, part I. lib. iii. cap. xlii, xliii. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 186. 540. No accounts of the *Canons* are leſs worthy of credit, than thoſe that are given by writers, who have been themſelves members of that order, ſuch as RAYMOND CHAPPONEL's *Hiſtoire des Chanoines*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 8vo. in the year 1699; for theſe writers, from fond prejudices in favour of their inſtitution, and an ambitious deſire of enhancing its merit and rendering it reſpectable, derive the origin of *canonical order* from CHRIST and his apoſtles, or trace it up, at leaſt, to the firſt ages of the Chriſtian church.

CENT. IX. PART II.

high repute; and from this time a great number of convents were erected for them through all the western provinces, and were richly endowed by the liberality of pious and opulent Christians. But this institution degenerated in a short time, like all others, from its primitive purity, and ceased to answer the laudable intention and design of its worthy founders [*k*].

The principal Greek writers.

XIII. Of the theological writers that flourished among the Greeks, the following are the most remarkable:

PHOTIUS, patriarch of *Constantinople*, a man of most profound and universal erudition, whose *Bibliotheca* [*l*], *Epistles*, and other writings, are yet valuable on many accounts.

NICEPHORUS, also a patriarch of the above-mentioned city, who, among other productions, published a warm defence of the worship of images against the enemies of that idolatrous service [*m*].

THEODORUS STUDITES, who acquired a name chiefly by his warm opposition to the *Iconoclasts*, and by the zeal with which he wrote in favour of image worship [*n*].

The same cause has principally contributed to transmit to after-ages the names of THEODORUS GRAPTUS, METHODIUS, who obtained the title of *Confessor* for his adherence to image-worship in

[*k*] CALMET, *Hist. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 591. *Hist. Litterqire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 536.

[*l*] See CAMUSAT, *Histoire des Journaux*, tom. i. p. 87.

[*m*] *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Martii ad d.* xiii. p. 293. OUDINUS, *Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 2.

☞ [*n*] THEODORE STUDITES was one of the most voluminous writers of this century, and would certainly have been known as a man of genius and learning in after-ages, though the controversy concerning images had never existed. There are of his writings, yet extant, 265 letters, several treatises against the Iconoclasts, 124 epigrams in Iambics, and a large manuscript, which contains a course of catechetical instruction concerning the duties of the monastic life.

the

the very face of perſecution, THEODORUS ABUCARA [o], PETRUS SICULUS, NICETAS DAVID, and others, who would probably have been long ſince buried in oblivion, had not the various conteſts between the Greek and Latin churches, and the diviſions of the former among themſelves upon the queſtion concerning images, excited the vehemence of theſe inconſiderable writers, and furniſhed them with an occaſion of making ſome noiſe in the world.

MOSES BARCEPHA, a Syrian biſhop, ſurpaſſed by far all whom we have now been mentioning, and deſerved the ſhining reputation which he has obtained in the republic of letters, as what we have yet extant of his works diſcover ſeveral marks of true genius, and an uncommon acquaintance with the art of writing [p].

Latin writers.

XIV. RABANUS MAURUS, archbiſhop of *Mentz*, is deſervedly placed at the head of the Latin writers of this age; the force of his genius, the extent of his knowledge, and the multitude of productions that flowed from his pen, entitle him to this diſtinguiſhed rank, and render improper all compariſon between him and his cotemporaries. He may be called the great light of *Germany* and *France*, ſince it was from the prodigious fund of knowledge he poſſeſſed, that theſe nations derived principally their religious inſtruction. His writings were every where in the hands of the learned [q], and were held in ſuch veneration, that, during four centuries, the moſt eminent of the Latin divines appealed to them as authority in

[o] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the article ABUCARA.

[p] Jos. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 127.

[q] See, for a particular account of the life and writings of RABANUS MAURUS, the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 151; as alſo the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *Febr.* p. 500.

religious

religious matters, and adopted almoſt univerſally the ſentiments they contained. After this illuſtrious prelate, the writers that are moſt worthy of mention are,

AGOBARD, archbiſhop of *Lyons*, a man of wiſdom and prudence, and far from being deſtitute of literary merit; but whoſe reputation has deſervedly ſuffered by his juſtifying and even fomenting the rebellion of LOTHAIRE and PEPIN againſt LEWIS the MEEK, their father and their ſovereign [*r*].

HILDUIN, abbot of *St. Dennis*, who acquired no ſmall reputation by a work entitled, *Areopagitica* [*s*].

EGINHARD, abbot of *Selingeſtat*, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, remarkable for the beauty of his diction, the perſpicuity and elegance of his ſtyle, and a variety of other literary accompliſhments [*t*].

CLAUDIUS, biſhop of *Turin*, whoſe *Expoſition* of ſeveral books of ſcripture [*u*], as alſo his *Chronology*, gained him an eminent and laſting reputation [*w*].

[*r*] See COLONIA, *Hiſt. Litter. de la ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 93. *General Dictionary*, at the article AGOBARD. *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 567. [AGOBARD oppoſed with great zeal both the worſhip and the uſe of images in his famous book *De picturis et imaginibus*, a work which has greatly embarraſſed the doctors of the Romiſh church.]

[*s*] *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 607.

[*t*] *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 550. See alſo the *Life of Charlemagne*, of which the beſt of fourteen editions is that publiſhed by SCHMINKIUS, at *Utrecht*, in the year 1711.

[*u*] This prelate, who was famous for his knowledge of the holy ſcriptures, compoſed 111 books of commentaries upon *Geneſis*, IV upon *Exodus*, and ſeveral upon *Leviticus*. He wrote alſo a commentary upon the *Goſpel of St. Matthew*, in which there are many excellent things, and an expoſition of all the *Epiſtles of St. Paul*. His commentary on the *Epiſtle to the Galatians* is printed, but all the reſt are in manuſcript.]

[*w*] See SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſ. de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 284.

FRECULF,

FRECULF, biſhop of *Lyſieux*, whoſe *Chronicle*, which is no more than a heavy compilation, is yet extant.

SERVATUS LUPUS, of whoſe compoſition we have ſeveral epiſtles and treatiſes; and who, though a copious and ſubtile writer, is yet defective in point of elegance and erudition [*x*].

DREPANIUS FLORUS, who left behind him ſeveral *Poems*, *An expoſition of certain books of ſcripture*, and other performances leſs worthy of attention [*y*].

CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, the author of *A commentary upon St. Matthew's Goſpel* [*z*].

GODESCHALC, a monk of *Orbais*, who rendered his name immortal by the controverſy which he ſet on foot concerning *Predeſtination and Free Grace*.

PASCHASIUS RADBERT [*a*], a name famous in the conteſts concerning *The real preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt*; and who, to paſs in ſilence his other writings, compoſed a book upon this very ſubject, which furniſhed abundant matter of diſpute throughout this century.

BERTRAMN, or RATRAMN, a monk of *Corby*, who deſerves the firſt rank among the writers that refuted the doctrine of RADBERT; and whoſe book concerning *The ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper*, which was compoſed by the order of CHARLES the BALD, gave alſo occaſion to many conteſts among learned divines [*b*].

HAYMO, biſhop of *Halberſtadt*, the laborious author of ſeveral treatiſes upon various ſubjects,

[*x*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 255.

[*y*] COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litter. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 135. *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 213.

[*z*] *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 84.

[*a*] For an account of RADBERT, ſee the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 287.

[*b*] We ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more particularly of BERTRAMN, and his book, in the following chapter.

and

and who is more to be eſteemed for his induſtry and diligence, than for his genius and learning [*c*].

WALAFRIDUS STRABO, who acquired no mean reputation by his *Poems*, his *Lives of the Saints*, and his *Explications* of many of the more difficult paſſages of ſcripture [*d*].

HINCMAR, archbiſhop of *Rheims*, a man of an imperious and turbulent ſpirit; but who deſerves, notwithſtanding, a diſtinguiſhed place among the Latin writers of this century, ſince his works diſcover an aſpiring genius, and an ardent zeal in the purſuit of truth, and tend, moreover, in a ſingular manner, to throw light both upon the civil and eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of the age in which he lived [*e*].

JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, an eminent philoſopher, and a learned divine, whoſe erudition was accompanied with uncommon marks of ſagacity and genius, and whoſe various performances, as well as his tranſlations from the Greek, gained him a ſhining and laſting reputation [*f*].

It is ſufficient barely to name REMIGIUS BERTHARIUS, ADO, AIMOIN HERIC, REGINO, abbot of *Prum*, and others, of whom the moſt common writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory give ample accounts.

[*c*] It is proper to obſerve, that a great part of the writings that are attributed to HAYMO, biſhop of *Halberſtadt*, were compoſed by REMI, or REMIGIUS, of *Auxerre*. See CASSIMIR OUDINUS, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* tom. ii. p. 330. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 111. tom. vi. p. 106. LE BEUF, *Recueil de Diſſ. ſur l'Hiſtoire de la France*, tom. i. p. 278.

[*d*] See the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 544.

[*e*] *Ibid.* tom. v. p. 416.

[*f*] See HERM. CONRINGIUS, *Antiq. Academicæ*, p. 309. *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 416.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church during this century.

I. THE zeal of CHARLEMAGNE for the intereſts of Chriſtianity, and his liberality to the learned, encouraged many to apply themſelves diligently to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, and to the purſuit of religious truth; and as long as this eminent ſet of divines remained, the weſtern provinces were happily preſerved from many errors, and from a variety of ſuperſtitious practices. Thus we find among the writers of this age ſeveral men of eminent talents, whoſe productions ſhew that the luſtre of true erudition and theology was not, as yet, totally eclipſed. But theſe illuſtrious luminaries of the church diſappeared one after the other, and barbariſm and ignorance, encouraged by their departure, reſumed their ancient ſeats, and brought, in their train, a prodigious multitude of devout follies, odious ſuperſtitions, and abominable errors. Nor did any encourage and propagate with more zeal and ardor theſe ſuperſtitious innovations, than the ſacerdotal orders, the ſpiritual guides of a deluded people. And if we enquire how it came to paſs, that the clergy were ſo zealous in ſuch an inglorious cauſe, we ſhall find that this zeal was, in ſome, the effect of ignorance, and, in others, the fruit of avarice and ambition; ſince much was to be gained both in point of authority and opulence from the progreſs of ſuperſtition. Chriſtianity among the Greeks and Orientals was almoſt in the ſame declining and deplorable ſtate; though there aroſe, from time to time, in the eaſtern provinces, men of ſuperior abilities, who endea-

The miſerable ſtate of Chriſtianity.

CENT. IX. PART II.

voured to ſupport the cauſe of true religion, and to raiſe it from the preſſures under which it laboured.

The cauſes to which it was owing.

II. The cauſes of this unhappy revolution, that covered the Chriſtian church with ſuperſtition and darkneſs, will appear evident to ſuch as are at all acquainted with the hiſtory of theſe times. The Oriental doctors, miſerably divided among themſelves, and involved in the bittereſt contentions and quarrels with the weſtern churches, loſt all notion of the true ſpirit and genius of Chriſtianity, and, corrupted and biaſſed by the prejudices and paſſions that are generally excited and nouriſhed by ill-managed controverſy, became incapable of promoting the true and eſſential intereſts of religion. Intent alſo upon defending the excellence and divine authority of their doctrine and diſcipline againſt the Latin doctors, and in maintaining among themſelves the worſhip of images which began to be warmly oppoſed, they advanced many things in the courſe of theſe diſputes that were highly erroneous, and as one error follows another, their number increaſed from day to day. The ſavage and unnatural lives of the monks and hermits, whoſe number was prodigious, and whoſe authority was conſiderable, who haunted the woods and deſerts, the gloomy ſcenes of their extravagant devotion, contributed much, among other cauſes, to the decay of ſolid and rational piety. Add to all this, the irruptions of the barbarous nations into the weſt, the atrocious exploits of uſurping princes, the drooping and neglected condition of all the various branches of learning, the ambitious frenzy of the Roman pontifs, who were inceſſantly gaping after new acceſſions of authority and dominion, the frauds and tricks of the monaſtic orders carried on under the ſpecious maſk of religion, and then we ſhall

ſee the true cauſes that founded the empire of ſuperſtition and error upon the ruin of virtue, piety, and reaſon.

III. The ignorance and corruption that diſhonoured the Chriſtian church, in this century, were great beyond meaſure; and were there no other examples of their enormity upon record, than the ſingle inſtance of that ſtupid veneration that was paid to the bones and carcaſſes of departed ſaints; this would be ſufficient to convince us of the deplorable progreſs of ſuperſtition. This idolatrous devotion was now conſidered as the moſt ſacred and momentous branch of religion, nor did any dare to entertain the ſmalleſt hopes of finding the Deity propitious, before they had aſſured themſelves of the protection and interceſſion of ſome one or other of the ſaintly order. Hence it was that every church, and indeed every private Chriſtian, had their particular patron among the ſaints, from an apprehenſion that their ſpiritual intereſts would be but indifferently managed by thoſe, who were already employed about the ſouls of others; for they judged, in this reſpect, of the ſaints as they did of mortals, whoſe capacity is too limited to comprehend a vaſt variety of objects. This notion rendered it neceſſary to multiply prodigiouſly the number of the ſaints, and to create daily new patrons for the deluded people; and this was done with the utmoſt zeal. The prieſts and monks ſet their invention at work, and peopled, at diſcretion, the inviſible world with imaginary protectors. They diſpelled the thick darkneſs which covered the pretended ſpiritual exploits of many holy men; and they invented both names and hiſtories of ſaints [g] that never exiſted, that they might not be at a loſs to furniſh

The corrupt ignorance and ſuperſtition that reigned in this century, appear even in the ſingle inſtance of the fooliſh veneration that was paid to the ſaints and their relics

[(g) See Dr. MIDDLETON's Letter from *Rome*, *paſſim*. in which we find the names of St. BACCHO, St. VIAR, St. AMPHIBOLUS, EUODIA, &c.]

niſh the credulous and wretched multitude with objects proper to perpetuate their ſuperſtition and to nouriſh their confidence. Many choſe their own guides, and committed their ſpiritual intereſts either to phantoms of their own creation, or to diſtracted fanatics, whom they eſteemed as ſaints, for no other reaſon than their having lived like madmen.

The ſaints canonized.

IV. The eccleſiaſtical councils found it neceſſary, at length, to ſet limits to the licentious ſuperſtition of thoſe ignorant wretches, who, with a view to have ſtill more friends at court, for ſuch were their groſs notions of things, were daily adding new ſaints to the liſt of their celeſtial mediators. They, accordingly, declared by a ſolemn decree, that no departed Chriſtian ſhould be conſidered as a member of the ſaintly order before the biſhop in a provincial council, and in preſence of the people, had pronounced him worthy of that diſtinguiſhed honour [*b*]. This remedy, feeble and illuſory as it was, contributed, in ſome meaſure, to reſtrain the fanatical temerity of the ſaint-makers; but, in its conſequences, it was the occaſion of a new acceſſion of power to the Roman pontif. Even ſo early as this century many were of opinion, that it was proper and expedient, though not abſolutely neceſſary, that the deciſions of biſhops and councils ſhould be confirmed by the conſent and authority of the Roman pontif, whom they conſidered as the ſupreme and univerſal biſhop; and this will not appear ſurpriſing to any who reflect upon the enormous ſtrides which the biſhops of *Rome* made towards unbounded dominion in this barbarous

[*b*] MABILLON, *Act. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc.* v. *Præf.* p. 44. LAUNOY, *De Lazari, Magdalenæ, et Marthæ in Provinciam appulſu*, cap. i. § 12. p. 342. tom. ii. part I. opp. FRANC. PAGI *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 259. tom. iii. p. 30.

and

and superstitious age, whose corruption and darkness were peculiarly favourable to their ambitious pretensions. It is true, we have no example of any person solemnly sainted by the bishop of *Rome* alone, before the tenth century [*i*], when UDALRIC, bishop of *Augsburg*, received this dignity in a formal manner from JOHN XV. It is however certain, that before that time the Roman pontifs were consulted in matters of that nature, and their judgment respected in the choice of those that were to be honoured with saintship [*k*]; and it was by such steps as these, that the church of *Rome* engrossed to itself the creation of these tutelary divinities, which at length was distinguished by the title of *Canonization*.

Lives of the saints.

V. This preposterous multiplication of saints was a new source of abuses and frauds. It was thought necessary to write the lives of these celestial patrons, in order to procure for them the veneration and confidence of a deluded multitude; and here lying wonders were invented, and all the resources of forgery and fable exhausted, to celebrate exploits which had never been performed, and to perpetuate the memory of holy persons who had never existed. We have yet extant a prodigious quantity of these trifling legends, the greatest part of which were, undoubtedly, forged after the time of CHARLEMAGNE by the monastic writers, who had both

[*i*] See DAN. PAPEBROCHIUS, *De solennium canonisationum initiis et progress. in Propylæo Actor. SS. mens. Maii, p.* 171; and the other authors who have written upon this subject, of which there is an ample list in the *Bibliographia Antiquar.* of FABRICIUS, cap. vii. § 25. p. 270.

[*k*] See the candid and impartial account that is given of this matter by the late pope BENEDICT XIV., in his laborious work, *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 50. tom. i. opp. edit. *Roman.* It were to be wished, that historians of the church of *Rome* would learn to imitate the prudence, moderation, and equity of that illustrious pontif.

CENT. IX. PART II.

the inclination and leiſure to edify the church by theſe pious frauds. The ſame impoſtors, who peopled the celeſtial regions with fictitious ſaints, employed alſo their fruitful inventions in embelliſhing with falſe miracles, and various other impertinent forgeries, the hiſtory of thoſe, who had been really martyrs or confeſſors in the cauſe of CHRIST; theſe fictions, however, did not paſs with impunity, but were ſeverely cenſured by ſome of the moſt eminent writers of the times in which they were impoſed upon the credulity of the public [*l*]. Various were the motives that engaged different perſons to propagate, or countenance, theſe impoſtures. Some were excited to this by the ſeductions of a falſe devotion, which reigned in this perverſe and ignorant age, and made them imagine that departed ſaints were highly delighted with the applauſes and veneration of mortals, and never failed to crown with peculiar marks of their favour and protection ſuch as were zealous in honouring their memories, and in celebrating their exploits. The proſpect of gain and the ambitious deſire of being reverenced by the multitude, engaged others to multiply the number, and to maintain the credit of the legends, or ſaintly regiſters. For the churches, that were dedicated to the ſaints, were perpetually crowded with ſupplicants, who flocked to them with rich preſents, in order to obtain ſuccour

[*l*] See SERVATUS LUPUS's *Vita Maximini*, p. 275, 276. and the candid and learned obſervations upon this ſubject that are to be found in various places of the works of the celebrated LAUNOY: *e. g.* in his *Diſputatio Epiſtolæ Petri de Marca, de tempore quo in Gallia Chriſti fides recepta*, cap. xiv. p. 110. in his *Diſſertationes de primis Chriſtianæ relig. in Gallia initiis*, Diſſ. ii. 142. 144, 145. 147. 168, 169. 181.—*De Lazari, Magdal. et Marthæ in Galliam appulſu*, p. 340.—*De Duobus Dionyſiis*, p. 527. 529, 530. tom. ii. part I. opp.—See alſo MARTENE *Theſaurus Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 151.—*Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 273.

under

under the afflictions they ſuffered, or deliverance from the dangers which they had reaſon to apprehend. And it was eſteemed alſo a high honour to be the more immediate miniſters of theſe tutelary mediators, who, as it is likewiſe proper to obſerve, were eſteemed and frequented in proportion to their antiquity, and to the number and importance of the pretended miracles that had rendered their lives illuſtrious. This latter circumſtance offered a ſtrong temptation to ſuch as were employed by the various churches in writing the lives of their tutelar ſaints, to ſupply by invention the defects of truth, and to embelliſh their legends with fictitious prodigies; nay, they were not only tempted to this impoſture, but were even obliged to make uſe of it in order to ſwell the fame of their reſpective patrons [*m*].

A paſſionate fondneſs for their relics prevails.

VI. But even all this was inſufficient to ſatisfy the demands of ſuperſtition, nouriſhed by the ſtratagems of a corrupt and deſigning prieſthood, and fomented by the zeal of the more ignorant and ſtupid ſons of the church. It was not enough to reverence departed ſaints, and to confide in their interceſſion and ſuccours; it was not enough to cloath them with an imaginary power of healing diſeaſes, working miracles, and delivering from all ſorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their cloaths, the apparel, and furniture they had poſſeſſed during their lives, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrified carcaſſes were laid, were treated with a ſtupid veneration, and ſuppoſed to retain the marvellous virtue of healing all diſorders both of body and mind, and of defending ſuch as poſſeſſed them againſt all the aſſaults and devices of Satan. The

[*m*] Of all the lives of the ſaints written in this century, none are more liable to ſuſpicion than thoſe drawn up by the Britons and Normans. See MABILLON *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedictin. ſub init.*

conſequence of this wretched notion was, that every one was eager to provide himſelf with theſe ſalutary remedies, for which purpoſe great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and ſubjected themſelves to all ſorts of hardſhips; while others made uſe of this deluſion to accumulate their riches, and to impoſe upon the miſerable multitude by the moſt impious and ſhocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and univerſal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to ſatisfy theſe demands, and were far from being nice in the methods they uſed for that end. The bodies of the ſaints were ſought by faſting and prayer inſtituted by the prieſt in order to obtain a divine anſwer, and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accompliſh their deſires; the holy carcaſe was always found, and that always in conſequence, as they impiouſly gave out, of the ſuggeſtion and inſpiration of God himſelf. Each diſcovery of this kind was attended with exceſſive demonſtrations of joy, and animated the zeal of theſe devout ſeekers to enrich the church ſtill more and more with this new kind of treaſure. Many travelled with this view into the eaſtern provinces, and frequented the places which CHRIST and his diſciples had honoured with their preſence, that, with the bones and other ſecret remains of the firſt heralds of the goſpel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling conſciences, ſave ſinking ſtates, and defend their inhabitants from all ſorts of calamities. Nor did theſe pious travellers return home empty; the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks found a rich prey in the ſtupid credulity of the Latin relic-hunters, and made a profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid conſiderable ſums for legs and arms, ſkulls and jaw-bones (ſeveral of which were Pagan, and ſome not human), and other

other things that were ſuppoſed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Chriſtian church; and thus the Latin churches came to the poſſeſſion of thoſe celebrated relics of St. MARK, St. JAMES, St. BARTHOLOMEW, CYPRIAN, PANTALEON, and others, which they ſhew at this day with ſo much oſtentation. But there were many, who, unable to procure for themſelves theſe ſpiritual treaſures by voyages and prayers, had recourſe to violence and theft; for all ſorts of means, and all ſorts of attempts in a cauſe of this nature were conſidered, when ſucceſsful, as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being [*n*].

VII. The ſtudy of the holy ſcriptures languiſhed much among the Greeks in this century. PHOTIUS, who compoſed a book of *Queſtions* [*o*], relating to various paſſages of ſcripture, *An expoſition of the Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, and other productions of the ſame nature [*p*], was one of the few that employed their talents in the illuſtration of the ſacred writings. He was a man of great ſagacity and genius, who preferred the dictates of reaſon to the deciſions of authority; notwithſtanding all which, he cannot be recommended as a model to

The expoſition of the ſcriptures neglected among the Greeks.

[*n*] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 6. who gives examples of the truth of this aſſertion.

☞ [*o*] This work, which is entitled *Amphilochia*, from its having been addreſſed to AMPHILOCHIUS, biſhop of *Cyzicum*, conſiſts of 308 queſtions, and anſwers to them; a ſixth part of which, at leaſt, are to be found in the *Epiſtles of Photius*, publiſhed at *London* in 1651, by biſhop MONTAGUE. The moſt of theſe queſtions relate to different texts of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*; but theſe are interſperſed with others of a philoſophical and literary kind. This work is ſtill extant in MSS. in the Vatican, Barberinian, and Bavarian libraries.

☞ [*p*] Such as a *catena*, a *chain*, of commentaries on the book of *Pſalms*, compiled from the writings of ATHANASIUS, BASIL, CHRYSOSTOM, &c. and a commentary upon the *Prophets*, both of which are yet extant in MSS. the former in the *Bibliotheca Segueriana*, or *Coiſliniana*, and the latter in the Vatican library.

CENT. IX. PART II.

other commentators. The other Greek writers, who attempted to explain the holy ſcriptures, did little more than compile and accumulate various paſſages from the commentators of the preceding ages; and this method was the origin of thoſe *Catenæ*, or chains of commentaries, ſo much in vogue among the Greeks during this century, of which a conſiderable number have come down to our times, and which conſiſted entirely in a collection of the explications of ſcripture that were ſcattered up and down in the ancient writers. The greateſt part of the theological writers, finding themſelves incapable of more arduous undertakings, confined their labours to this compiling method, to the great detriment of ſacred criticiſm.

Defects of the Latin commentators.

VIII. The Latin commentators were vaſtly ſuperior in number to thoſe among the Greeks, which was owing to the zeal and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, who, both by his liberality and by his example, had excited and encouraged the doctors of the preceding age to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures. Of theſe expoſitors there are two, at leaſt, who are worthy of eſteem, CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, whoſe *Commentary on St.* MATTHEW, is come down to our times [q]; and the abbot BERTHARIUS, whoſe *Two Books concerning Fundamentals*, are alſo ſaid to be yet extant. The reſt ſeem unequal to the important office of ſacred critics, and may be divided into two claſſes, which we have had already occaſion to mention in the courſe of this hiſtory; the claſs of thoſe, who merely collected and reduced into a maſs the opinions and explications of the ancients, and that

[q] See R. SIMON, *Hiſtoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouv. Teſtament*, chap. xxv. p. 348; as alſo his *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 293. who, in his xxvith and xxviith chapter, gives an account of moſt of the writers mentioned here.

of

of a fantaſtic ſet of expoſitors, who were always hunting after myſteries in the plaineſt expreſſions, and labouring to deduce a variety of abſtruſe and hidden ſignifications from every paſſage of ſcripture, all which they did, for the moſt part, in a very clumſy and uncouth manner. At the head of the firſt claſs was RABANUS MAURUS, who acknowledges that he borrowed from the ancient doctors the materials he made uſe of in illuſtrating the Goſpel of St. MATTHEW, and the Epiſtles of St. PAUL; WALAFRID STRABO, who borrowed his explications chiefly from RABANUS; CLAUDIUS of *Turin*, who trod in the footſteps of AUGUSTIN and ORIGEN; HINCMAR, whoſe *Expoſition of the* IV *Books of Kings* compiled from the fathers, are yet extant; REMIGIUS of *Auxerre*, who derived from the ſame ſource his illuſtrations on the *Pſalms*, and other books of ſacred writ: SEDULIUS, who explained in the ſame manner the Epiſtles of St. PAUL; FLORUS, HAYMO biſhop of *Halberſtadt*, and others, whom, for the ſake of brevity, we paſs in ſilence.

Allegoriſts.

IX. RABANUS MAURUS, whom we introduced above at the head of the compilers of the fathers, deſerves alſo an eminent place among the allegorical commentators, on account of his diffuſe and tedious work, entitled *Scripture Allegories*. To this claſs alſo belong SMARAGDUS, HAYMO, SCOTUS, PASHASIUS RADBERT, and many others, whom it is not neceſſary to mention. The fundamental and general principle, in which all the writers of this claſs agree, is, that, beſides the literal ſignification of each paſſage in ſcripture, there are hidden and deep ſenſes which eſcape the vulgar eye; but they are not agreed about the number of theſe myſterious ſignifications. Some attribute to every phraſe three ſenſes; others four; others again five; nay, their number is carried to ſeven by ANGELOME, a monk of *Lyſieux*, an acute,

CENT. IX. PART II.

though fantaſtic writer, and who is far from deſerving the meaneſt rank among the expoſitors of this century [r].

The ſtate of didactic theology.

X. The teachers of theology were ſtill more contemptible than the commentators, and the Greeks, as well as the Latins, were extremely negligent both in unfolding the nature, and proving the truth of the doctrines of Chriſtianity. Their method of inculcating divine truth was dry and unſatisfactory, and more adapted to fill the memory with ſentences, than to enlighten the underſtanding, or to improve the judgment. The Greeks, for the moſt part, followed implicitly DAMASCENUS, while the Latins ſubmitted their hoodwinked intellects to the authority of AUGUSTINE. Authority became the teſt of truth, and ſupplied in arrogance what it wanted in argument. That magiſterial deciſions were employed in the place of reaſon, appears manifeſtly from the *Collectaneum de tribus quæſtionibus* of SERVATUS LUPUS; and alſo from a *Treatiſe* of REMIGIUS, *concerning the neceſſity of holding faſt the truths of the goſpel, and of maintaining inviolable the ſacred authority of the holy and orthodox fathers.* If any deigned to appeal to the authority of the ſcriptures in defence of their ſyſtems, they either explained them in an allegorical manner, or underſtood them in the ſenſe that had been given to them by the decrees of councils, or in the writings of the fathers; from which ſenſes they thought it both unlawful and impious to depart. The Iriſh doctors alone, and particularly JOHANNES SCOTUS, had the courage to ſpurn the ignomini-

[r] See the Preface to his *Commentary on the book of Kings*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, tom. xv. p. 308. The commentary of ANGELOME upon the book of *Geneſis* was publiſhed by BERNARD PEZIUS, in his *Theſaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. i. part I. but, indeed, the loſs would not have been great had it never ſeen the light.

OUS

ous fetters of authority, and to explain the sublime doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of reason, and the principles of true philosophy. But this noble attempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a superstitious age, and exposed them to the hatred of the Latin theologists, who would not permit either reason or philosophy to meddle themselves in religious matters [*s*].

Of Christian morality.

XI. The important science of morals suffered, like all others, in the hands of ignorant and unskilful writers. The labours of some were wholly employed in collecting from the fathers an indigested heap of maxims and sentences concerning religious and moral duties; and such, among others, was the work of ALVARUS, intitled *Scintillæ Patrum.* Others wrote in a more systematic manner concerning virtue and vice, such as HALITGARIUS, RABANUS MAURUS, and JONAS, bishop of *Orleans*; but the representations they gave of the one and the other were very different from those which we find in the gospel of CHRIST. Others again fell into that most absurd and deluſive method of instructing the ignorant in the will of God by a fantastic combination of figures and allegories; and several of the Greeks began to turn their studies towards the resolving *cases of conscience* [*t*], in order to remove the difficulties that arose in scrupulous and timorous minds. We pass in silence the writers of homilies and books of penance, of which there was a considerable number in this century.

[*s*] For an account of the persecution and hatred that JOHANNES SCOTUS suffered in the cause of reason and liberty, see DU BOULAY, *Hist. Academ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 182; as also MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* v. 392.

[*t*] See NICEPHORI *Chartophylac. Epistolæ Duæ*, in the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*, tom. iii. p. 413.

XII. The

The progreſs of myſticiſm.

XII. The doctrine of the myſtics, whoſe origin is falſely attributed to DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, and whoſe precepts were deſigned to elevate the ſoul above all ſenſible and terreſtrial objects, and to unite it to the Deity in an ineffable manner, had been now for a long time in vogue among the Greeks, and more eſpecially among the monaſtic orders. And to augment the credit of this fanatical ſect, and multiply its followers, MICHAEL SYNCELLUS and METHODIUS compoſed the moſt pompous and eloquent panegyrics upon the memory of DIONYSIUS, in which his virtues were celebrated with the utmoſt exaggeration. The Latins were not as yet bewitched with the ſpecious appearance, and the illuſory charms of the myſtic devotion, which was equally adapted to affect perſons of a lively fancy and thoſe of a more gloomy turn of mind. They lived in a happy ignorance of this contagious doctrine, when the Grecian emperor MICHAEL BALBUS ſent to LEWIS the MEEK, in the year 824, a copy of the pretended works [*u*] of DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, which fatal preſent kindled immediately the holy flame of myſticiſm in the weſtern provinces, and filled the Latins with the moſt enthuſiaſtic admiration of this new religion. The tranſlation of theſe ſpurious works into Latin by the expreſs order of the emperor [*w*], who could not be eaſy while

[*u*] USSERII *Sylloge Epp. Hibernicar.* p. 54, 55. ☞ The ſpurioufneſs of theſe works is now univerſally granted by the moſt learned and impartial of the Roman catholic writers, as they contain accounts of many events that happened ſeveral ages after the time of DIONYSIUS, and were not at all mentioned until after the fifth century. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. liv. tom. xi. p. 520. edit. *Bruxelles.*

[*w*] That theſe books were tranſlated by the order of LEWIS, appears manifeſtly from the *Epiſtle* to that emperor, which HILDUIN prefixed to his *Areopagetica*, and in which (p. 66. edit. *Colon.* 1563.) we find the following paſſage: *De notitia librorum, quos* (Dionyſius) *patrio ſermone conſcripſit, et quibus peten-*

while his ſubjects were deprived of ſuch ineſtimable treaſure, contributed much to the progreſs of myſticiſm. By the order of the ſame emperor, HILDUIN, abbot of St. *Denys*, compoſed an account of the life, actions, and writings of DIONYSIUS, under the title of *Areopagitica*, in which work, among other impudent fictions, uſual in thoſe times of ſuperſtition and impoſture, he maintained, in order to exalt the honour of his nation, that DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, and DIONYSIUS the biſhop of *Paris*, were one and the ſame perſon [x]. This fable, which was invented with unparalleled aſſurance, was received with the moſt perfect and unthinking credulity, and made ſuch a deep and permanent impreſſion upon the minds of the French, that the repeated demonſtrations of its falſehood have not as yet been ſufficient to ruin its credit entirely. As the firſt tranſlation of the works of DIONYSIUS, that had been done by the order of LEWIS the MEEK, was probably in a barbarous and obſcure ſtyle, a new and more elegant one was given by the famous JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, at the requeſt of CHARLES the

petentibus illos compoſuit, lectio nobis per Dei gratiam et veſtram ordinationem, CUJUS DISPENSATIONE INTERPRETATOS, *ſcrinia noſtra eos petentibus referant, ſatisfacit.* From this paſſage it is evident that they are miſtaken, who affirm that the Latin tranſlation of the works of DIONYSIUS was not made before the time of CHARLES the BALD. And they err alſo, who, with MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. ii. lib. xxix. § 59. p. 488. and the authors of the *Hiſt. Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 425. inform us, that MICHAEL BALBUS ſent theſe works already tranſlated into Latin to the emperor LEWIS. It is amazing how men of learning could fall into this latter error, after reading the following paſſage in the *Epiſtle* above quoted: *Authenticos namque eoſdem* (Dionyſii) *libros Græca lingua conſcriptos, cum echonomus eccleſiæ Conſtantinopolitanæ et ceteri miſſi Michaelis legatione—functi ſunt—pro munere magno ſuſcepimus*

[x] LAUNOY, *Diſſ. de Diſcrimine Dionyſii Areopag. et Pariſienſis*, cap. iv. p. 38. tom. ii. p. I. opp. as alſo the writings of this great man concerning the *Two Dionyſiuſes*.

BALD,

BALD, the publication of which increaſed conſiderably the partiſans of the myſtic theology among the French, Italians, and Germans. SCOTUS himſelf was ſo enchanted with this new doctrine, that he incorporated it into his philoſophical ſyſtem, and upon all occaſions either accommodated his philoſophy to it, or explained it according to the principles of his philoſophy.

The ſtate of polemic, or controverſial theology.

XIII. The defence of Chriſtianity againſt the Jews and Pagans was greatly neglected in this century, in which the inteſtine diſputes and diſſentions that divided the church, gave ſufficient employment to ſuch as had an inclination to controverſy, or a talent of managing it with dexterity and knowledge. AGOBARD, however, as alſo AMULO and RABANUS MAURUS, chaſtiſed the inſolence and malignity of the Jews, and expoſed their various abſurdities and errors, while the emperor LEO, THEODORUS ABUCARA, and other writers, whoſe performances are loſt, employed their polemic labours againſt the progreſs of the Saracens, and refuted their impious and extravagant ſyſtem.. But it may be obſerved in general of thoſe who wrote againſt the Saracens, that they reported many things, both concerning MAHOMET and his religion, which were far from being true; and if, as there is too much reaſon to imagine, they did this deſignedly and knowing the falſhood, or at leaſt the uncertainty of what they alleged againſt theſe infidels, we muſt look upon their writings rather as intended to deter the Chriſtians from apoſtaſy, than to give a rational refutation of the Saracen doctrine.

The controverſy concerning images among the Greeks.

XIV. The conteſts of the Chriſtians among themſelves were carried on with greater eagerneſs and animoſity than the diſputes in which they were engaged with the common enemies of their faith; and theſe conteſts were daily productive of new calamities and diſorders which diſhonoured their

their profeſſion, and caſt a heavy, though undeſerved reproach upon the cauſe of true religion. After the baniſhment of IRENE, the controverſy concerning images broke out anew among the Greeks, and was carried on by the contending parties, during the half of this century, with various and uncertain ſucceſs. The emperor NICEPHORUS, though he did not abrogate the decrees of the council of *Nice*, nor order the images to be taken out of the churches, yet deprived the patrons of image-worſhip of all power to moleſt or injure their adverſaries, and ſeems upon the whole to have been an enemy to that idolatrous ſervice. But his ſucceſſor MICHAEL CUROPALATES, ſurnamed RHANGEBE, acted in a very different manner. Feeble and timorous, and dreading the rage of the prieſts and monks that maintained the cauſe of images, he favoured that cauſe during his ſhort reign, and perſecuted its adverſaries with the greateſt bitterneſs and cruelty. The ſcene changed again, upon the acceſſion of LEO the Armenian to the empire, who aboliſhed the decrees of the Nicene council relating to the uſe and worſhip of images, in a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, A. D. 814 [y]; without however enacting any penal laws againſt their idolatrous worſhippers. This moderation, far from ſatisfying the patriarch NICEPHORUS, and the other partiſans of image-worſhip, only ſerved to encourage their obſtinacy, and to increaſe their inſolence; upon which the emperor removed the haughty prelate from his office, and chaſtiſed the fury of ſeveral of his adherents with a deſerved puniſhment. His ſucceſſor MICHAEL, ſurnamed BALBUS, or the *Stammerer*, was obliged to obſerve the ſame conduct, and to depart from the clemency and indulgence, which, in the beginning

[y] FLEURY and ſome other writers place the meeting of this council in the year 815.

of

CENT. XI. PART II.

of his reign, he had diſcovered towards the worſhippers of images, whoſe idolatry, however, he was far from approving; the monks more eſpecially provoked his indignation by their fanatical rage, and forced him to treat them with particular ſeverity. But the zeal of his ſon and ſucceſſor THEOPHILUS, in diſcouraging this new idolatry, was ſtill more vehement; for he oppoſed the worſhippers of images with great violence, and went ſo far as to put to death ſome of the more obſtinate ringleaders of that impetuous faction.

XV. Upon the death of THEOPHILUS, which happened in the year 842, the regency was entruſted with the empreſs THEODORA during her ſon's minority. This ſuperſtitious princeſs, fatigued with the importunate ſolicitations of the monks, deluded by their forged miracles, and not a little influenced alſo by their inſolent threats, aſſembled, in the year above mentioned, a council at *Conſtantinople*, in which the decrees of the ſecond Nicene council were reinſtated in their loſt authority, and the Greeks were indulged in their corrupt propenſity to image-worſhip by a law which encouraged that wretched idolatry [z]. So that after a controverſy, which had been carried on during the ſpace of an hundred and ten years, the cauſe of idolatry triumphed over the dictates of reaſon and Chriſtianity; the whole eaſt, the Armenians excepted, bowed down before the victorious images; nor did any of the ſucceeding emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of this ſuperſtitious phrenzy, or reſtrain them in the performance of this childiſh worſhip. The council that was held at *Conſtantinople* under PHOTIUS, in the year 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks

[z] See FRED. SPANHEIM, *Hiſtoria Imaginum*, ſect. viii. p. 845. tom. ii. opp.—LENFANT, *Preſervatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de Rome*, tom. iii. lett. xiv. p. 147. lett. xviii, xix. p. 509.

the *Eighth general council*, gave a farther degree of force and vigour to idolatry, by maintaining the ſanctity of images, and approving, confirming, and renewing the Nicene decrees. The ſuperſtitious Greeks, who were blind-led by the monks in the moſt ignominious manner, eſteemed this council as a moſt ſignal bleſſing derived to them from the immediate interpoſition of heaven, and accordingly inſtituted in commemoration thereof an anniverſary feſtival, which was called the *Feaſt of Orthodoxy* [a]. CENT. IX. PART II.

XVI. The triumph of images, notwithſtanding the zealous efforts of the Roman pontifs in their favour, was obtained with much more difficulty among the Latins, than it had been among the Greeks; for the former maintained as yet that invaluable, and indeed unalienable, privilege of judging for themſelves in religious matters, and were far from being diſpoſed to ſubmit their reaſon implicitly to the deciſions of the pontif, or to look upon any thing as infallible and true, which had authority for its only foundation. The moſt of the European Chriſtians, as we have ſeen already, ſteered a middle courſe between the idolaters and the Iconoclaſts, between thoſe who were zealous for the worſhip of images on the one hand, and thoſe who were averſe to all uſe of them on the other. They were of opinion, that images might be ſuffered as the means of aiding the memory of the faithful, and of calling to their remembrance the pious exploits and the virtuous actions of the perſons they repreſented; but they deteſted all thoughts of paying them the leaſt marks of religious homage or adoration. Mi- Among the Latins.

[a] See GRETSER *Obſervat. in Codinum de officiis Aulæ et Eccleſ. Conſtantinopolitanæ*, lib. iii. cap. viii. as alſo the *Ceremoniale Byzantinum*, lately publiſhed by REISK, lib. i. c. xxviii. p. 92.

CHAEL

CENT. IX. PART II.

CHAEL BALBUS, when he ſent, in the year 824, a ſolemn embaſſy to LEWIS the MEEK, to renew and confirm the treaties of friendſhip and peace that had been concluded between his predeceſſors in the empire and CHARLEMAGNE; charged his miniſters, in a particular manner, to bring over the king of the Franks [*b*] to the party of the Iconoclaſts, that they might gradually ſuppreſs, by their united influence, the worſhip of images, and thus reſtore concord and tranquillity to the church. LEWIS, upon this occaſion, aſſembled a council at *Paris*, A. D. 824 [*c*], in order to examine the propoſal of the Grecian emperor, in which it was reſolved to adhere to the decrees of the council of *Frankfort*, which allowed the *uſe* of images in the churches, but ſeverely prohibited the treating them with the ſmalleſt marks of religious *worſhip*. But in proceſs of time the European Chriſtians departed gradually from the obſervance of this injunction, and fell imperceptibly into a blind ſubmiſſion to the deciſions of

☞ [*b*] So MICHAEL and his ſon THEOPHILUS ſtyle LEWIS in their letter to him, refuſing him the title of emperor, to which, however, he had an undoubted right in conſequence of the treaties which they now deſired to renew.

☞ [*c*] FLEURY, LE SUEUR, and other hiſtorians, place unanimouſly this council in the year 825. It may be proper to obſerve here, that the proceedings of this council evidently ſhew, that the deciſions of the Roman pontif were by no means looked upon at this time either as obligatory or infallible. For when the letter of Pope ADRIAN, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almoſt unanimouſly rejected, as containing abſurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the ſecond council of *Nice*, relating to image-worſhip, were alſo cenſured by the Gallican biſhops; and the authority of that council, though received by ſeveral popes as an *œcumenical* one, abſolutely rejected. And what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican biſhops heretics, nor exclude them from the communion of the apoſtolic ſee. See FLEURY, liv. xlvii.

the Roman pontif, whoſe influence and authority grew more formidable from day to day: ſo that towards the concluſion of this century, the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain kind of religious homage to the ſaintly images, in which their example was followed by the Germans and other nations [*d*].

Several Iconoclaſts among the Latins.

XVII. Notwithſtanding this apoſtaſy, the Iconoclaſts were not deſtitute of adherents among the Latins. The moſt eminent of theſe was CLAUDIUS, biſhop of *Turin*, by birth a Spaniard, and alſo a diſciple of FELIX, biſhop of *Urgel*. This zealous prelate, as ſoon as he had obtained the epiſcopal dignity through the favour of LEWIS the MEEK, began to exerciſe the duties of his function in the year 823, by ordering all images, and even the croſs, to be caſt out of the churches, and committed to the flames. The year following he compoſed a treatiſe, in which he not only defended theſe vehement proceedings, and declared againſt the *uſe*, as well as the *worſhip*, of images, but alſo broached ſeveral other opinions, that were quite contrary to the notions of the multitude, and to the prejudices of the times. He denied, among other things, in oppoſition to the Greeks, that the croſs was to be honoured with any kind of worſhip; he treated relics with the utmoſt contempt, as abſolutely deſtitute of the virtues that were attributed to them, and cenſured with much freedom and ſeverity thoſe pilgrimages to the holy land, and thoſe voyages to the tombs of the ſaints, which, in this century, were looked upon as extremely ſalutary, and particularly meritorious. This noble ſtand, in the defence of true religion, drew upon CLAUDIUS a

[*d*] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 488.—Id. *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc.* iv. part I. p. 7, 8.—LE COINTE, *Annal. Eccleſ. Francor.* tom. iv. *ad a.* 824.

CENT. IX. PART II.

multitude of adverſaries; the ſons of ſuperſtition ruſhed upon him from all quarters; THEODEMIR DUNGALLUS, JONAS of *Orleans*, and WALAFRIDUS STRABO [*e*] united to overwhelm him with their voluminous anſwers. But the learned and venerable prelate maintained his ground [*f*], and ſupported his cauſe with ſuch dexterity and force that it remained triumphant, and gained new credit. And hence it happened, that the city of *Turin* and the adjacent country were, for a long time after the death of CLAUDIUS, much leſs infected with ſuperſtition than the other parts of *Europe*.

Continuation of the controverſy concerning the derivation or proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt.

XVIII. The controverſy that had been carried on in the preceding century concerning the *proceſſion* (if we may be allowed that term) of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, and alſo concerning the word *filioque*, foiſted by the Latins into the Creed of *Conſtantinople*, broke out now with redoubled vehemence, and from a private diſpute became a flaming conteſt between the Greek and Latin churches. The monks of *Jeruſalem* diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this controverſy, and complained particularly of the interpolation of the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the ſon*, in the above-mentioned ſymbol; nor did they ſtop here, but diſpatched to CHARLEMAGNE, in the year 809, a certain eccleſiaſtic of their order, whoſe name was JOHN, to obtain ſatisfaction in this matter [*g*]. The affair was debated in due

☞ [*e*] In order to do juſtice to the adverſaries of CLAUDIUS here mentioned, it is neceſſary to obſerve, that they only maintained the innocence and uſefulneſs of images, without pretending to repreſent them as objects of religious worſhip.

[*f*] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 488.—*Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedict.* p. 8.—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 491. & tom. v. p. 27. 64.—JAQ. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformées*, tom. i. period iv. p. 38. ed. in 4to.

[*g*] See STEPH. BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. vii. p. 14.

form, both in a council aſſembled this ſame year at *Aix-la-Chapelle* and at *Rome*, in preſence of the ſovereign pontif LEO III., to whom the emperor had ſent ambaſſadors for that purpoſe. LEO adopted the doctrine which repreſented the Holy Ghoſt as proceeding from the Father and the Son, but he condemned the addition that had been made to the ſymbol [*b*], and declared it as his opinion, that the word *filioque*, or *from the ſon*, as it was a glaring interpolation, ought to be omitted in reading the ſymbol, and at length ſtruck out of it entirely, not every where at once, but in ſuch a prudent manner as to prevent diſturbance. His ſucceſſors were of the ſame opinion: the word, however, being once admitted, not only kept its place in oppoſition to the Roman pontifs, but was by degrees added to the ſymbol in all the Latin churches [*i*].

The controverſy concerning the euchariſt ſet on foot by Paſcaſius Radbert.

XIX. To theſe diſputes of ancient origin were added controverſies entirely new, and particularly that famous one *Concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Chriſt were preſent in the euchariſt*. It had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the church, that the body and blood of CHRIST *were* adminiſtered to thoſe who received the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that they were conſequently *preſent* at that holy inſtitution; but the ſentiments of Chriſtians concerning the *nature* and *manner* of this *preſence* were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with preciſion that important point, or preſcribed the manner in which this pretended preſence was to be

☞ [*b*] This addition of the word *filioque* to the ſymbol of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* was made in the vth and vith centuries by the churches of *Spain*, and their example was followed by moſt of the Gallican churches, where the ſymbol was read and ſung with this addition.

[*i*] See LE COINTE, *Annal. Eccleſ. Francor.* tom. iv. *ad A.* 809.—LONGUEVAL, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. v. p. 151.

underſtood. Both reaſon and folly were hitherto left free in this matter, nor had any imperious mode of faith ſuſpended the exerciſe of the one, or reſtrained the extravagance of the other. But in this century PASCASIUS RADBERT, a monk, and afterwards abbot of *Corbey*, pretended to explain with preciſion, and to determine with certainty, the doctrine of the church on this head, for which purpoſe he compoſed, in the year 831, a treatiſe *Concerning the ſacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt* [*k*]. A ſecond edition of this treatiſe, reviſed with care and conſiderably augmented, was preſented in the year 845 to CHARLES the BALD, and gave principally occaſion to the warm and important controverſy that enſued. The doctrine of PASCASIUS amounted in general to the two following propoſitions: *Firſt*, that, after the conſecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's ſupper, nothing remained of theſe ſymbols but the *outward figure*, under which the body and blood of CHRIST were really and locally *preſent*; and *ſecondly*, that the body of CHRIST thus preſent in the euchariſt was the *ſame body that was born of the Virgin, that ſuffered upon the Croſs, and was raiſed from the dead.* This new doctrine, and more eſpecially the ſecond propoſition now mentioned, excited, as might well be expected, the aſtoniſhment of many. Accordingly it was oppoſed by RABANUS MAURUS, HERIBALD, and others, though they did not all refute it in the ſame method, nor upon the ſame principles. CHARLES the BALD, upon this occaſion, ordered

[*k*] See MABILLON, *Annales Benedict.* ii. p. 539. An accurate edition of RADBERT's book is publiſhed by MARTENE, in the ix. *tome* of his *Ampliſſ. Collect. veter. ſcriptor.* p. 378. The life and actions of this wrong-headed divine are treated of at large by MABILLON, in his *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* iv. part II. 126, and, by the Jeſuits, in the *Acta SS. Antwerp. ad d.* xxvi. *Aprilis.*

the

the famous RATRAMN and JOHANNES SCOTUS to draw up a clear and rational explication of that important doctrine which RADBERT ſeemed to have ſo egregiouſly corrupted [*l*]. Theſe learned divines executed with zeal and diligence the order of the emperor. The treatiſe of SCOTUS periſhed in the ruins of time, but that of RATRAMN is ſtill extant [*m*], and furniſhed ample matter of diſpute both in the laſt and preſent century [*n*].

And carried on by his adverſary Bertramn.

XX. It is remarkable that in this controverſy each of the contending parties were almoſt as much divided among themſelves as they were at variance with their adverſaries. RADBERT, who began the diſpute, contradicts himſelf in many places, departs from his own principles, and maintains in one part of his book concluſions that he had diſavowed in another. His principal adverſary BERTRAMN, or RATRAMN, ſeems in ſome reſpects liable to the ſame charge; he appears to follow in general the doctrine of thoſe, who deny that the body and blood of CHRIST are *really* preſent in the holy ſacrament, and to affirm on the contrary that they are only repreſented by the bread and wine as their ſigns or ſymbols. There are, however, ſeveral paſſages in his book which ſeem inconſiſtent with this juſt and rational notion of the euchariſt, or at leaſt as ſuſceptible of dif-

[*l*] For an account of RATRAMN, or BERTRAMN, and his famous book which has made ſo much noiſe in the world, ſee FABRICIUS *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1661.

☞ [*m*] A new Engliſh tranſlation of the book of BERTRAMN, prieſt and monk of *Corbey*, *Concerning the* BODY *and* BLOOD *of* JESUS CHRIST *in the ſacrament*, was publiſhed in *Dublin* in the year 1753; to which is prefixed a very learned and judicious Hiſtorical Diſſertation concerning this famous author and his works, in which both are ably defended againſt the calumnies and fictions of the Roman catholic writers.

[*n*] There is an account, but a partial one, of this controverſy in MABILLON's *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. part II. *Benedict.* p. viii. which the curious reader will therefore do well to compare with BASNAGE's *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. 909.

ferent

CENT. IX. PART II.

ferent interpretations, and have therefore given rise to various disputes. JOHANNES SCOTUS, whose philosophical genius rendered him more accurate, and shed through his writings that logical precision so much wanted, and so highly desirable in polemical productions, was the only disputant in this contest who expressed his sentiments with perspicuity, method, and consistency, and declared plainly that the bread and wine were the *signs* and *symbols* of the *absent* body and blood of CHRIST. All the other theologists of his time fluctuate and waver in their opinions, express themselves with ambiguity, and embrace and reject the same tenets at different times, as if they had no fixed or permanent principles concerning the matter in question. From all this, however, it evidently appears, that there was not as yet in the Latin church any fixed or universally received opinion concerning the manner in which the body and blood of *Christ* are present in the eucharist.

XXI. The disputants in this controversy charged each other reciprocally with the most odious doctrines, which each party drew by way of consequences from the tenets they opposed, a method of proceeding as unjust, as it is common in all kinds of debate. Hence arose that imaginary heresy, that upon the triumphant progress of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the eleventh century, was branded with the title of *Stercoranism*, and of which the true origin was as follows: They who, embracing the opinion of PASCASIUS RADBERT, believed that the bread and wine in the sacrament were substantially changed after the consecration, and preserved only their external figure, drew a most unjust conclusion from the opinion of their adversaries, who maintained on the contrary that the bread and wine preserved their substance, and that CHRIST's body and blood were only figuratively, and not really present in the

the euchariſt. They alleged that the doctrine of the latter implied, that the body of Chriſt was digeſted in the ſtomach, and was thrown out with the other excrements. But this conſequence was quickly retorted upon thoſe that imagined it; for they who denied the metamorphoſis of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of CHRIST, charged the ſame enormous conſequence upon their antagoniſts who believed this tranſmutation; and the charge was much more applicable certainly to the latter than to the former. The truth of the matter is, that it was neither truly applicable to the one nor to the other, and their mutual reproaches, moſt wretchedly founded, ſhew rather a ſpirit of invective, than a zeal for the truth. The charge of *Stercoraniſm* is but a malignant invention; it can never, without the moſt abſurd impudence, be brought againſt thoſe who deny the tranſmutation of the bread into the body of CHRIST; it may indeed be charged upon ſuch as allow of this tranſmutation, though it be a conſequence that none of them, who were not frenetic, did perhaps ever avow [o].

The controverſy concerning *predeſtination* and *grace*, ſet on foot by Godeſchalcus.

XXII. While this controverſy was at its greateſt height, another, of a quite different kind, and of much more importance, aroſe, whoſe unhappy conſequences are yet felt in the reformed churches. The ſubject of this new conteſt was the doctrine of *predeſtination* and *divine grace*, and its riſe is univerſally attributed to GODESCHALCUS, an illuſtrious Saxon, who had entered involuntarily into the monaſtic order in the convent of *Fulda*, from whence he removed to the monaſtery of *Orbais*, in the dioceſe of *Soiſſons*, where he proſecuted his theological ſtudies with great aſſiduity,

[o] For an account of the *Stercoraniſts*, ſee MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part II. p. 21.—J. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 926. and a Treatiſe of the learned Dr. PFAFF, publiſhed at *Tubingue* in 1750.

but alſo with an inſatiable deſire of ſounding the deepeſt myſteries, and of being *wiſe above what is written.* This eminent eccleſiaſtic, upon his return from *Rome* in the year 847, took up his lodging for ſome time with count EBERALD, one of the firſt noblemen at the court of the emperor LOTHAIRE, where he diſcourſed largely concerning the intricate doctrine of *predeſtination* in preſence of NOTHINGUS, biſhop of *Verona*, and maintained that GOD, from all eternity, had pre-ordained ſome to everlaſting life, and others to everlaſting puniſhment and miſery. RABANUS MAURUS, who was by no means his friend, being informed of his propagating this doctrine, oppoſed him with all his might. To render his oppoſition more ſucceſsful, he began by repreſenting GODESCHALCUS as a corrupter of the true religion, and a forger of monſtrous hereſies, in ſome letters addreſſed to count EBERALD, and to the biſhop of *Verona*. And when the accuſed monk came from *Italy* into *Germany* to juſtify himſelf againſt theſe clamours, and for that purpoſe appeared at *Mentz*, of which RABANUS his accuſer was archbiſhop, he was condemned in a council aſſembled by the latter in that city A. D. 848, and ſent from thence to HINCMAR, archbiſhop of *Rheims*, in which dioceſe he had received the order of prieſthood. HINCMAR, who was devoted to the intereſts of RABANUS, aſſembled a council at *Quiercy* A. D. 849, in which GODESCHALCUS was condemned a ſecond time, and was alſo treated in a manner equally repugnant to the principles of religion and the dictates of humanity. Becauſe he was firm in maintaining his doctrine, which he affirmed, and indeed with truth, to be the doctrine of St. AUGUSTINE, the imperious HINCMAR degraded him from the prieſthood, and was ſo barbarous as to order him to be whipped with the utmoſt ſeverity, until the force of his pain overpowering

powering his conſtancy obliged him, according to the commands of his reverend executioners, to burn with his own hands the juſtification of his opinions which he had preſented to the council of *Mentz*. After theſe barbarous proceedings, the unfortunate monk was caſt into priſon in the monaſtery of *Hautvilliers*, where he ended his miſery and his days in the year 868, or the year following, maintaining with his laſt breath the doctrine for which he had ſuffered.

The hiſtory of this conteſt.

XXIII. While GODESCHALCUS lay in priſon, his doctrine gained him followers, his ſufferings excited compaſſion, and both together produced a conſiderable ſchiſm in the Latin church. RATRAMN, monk of *Corbey*, PRUDENTIUS, biſhop of *Troyes*, LOUP, or LUPUS, abbot of *Ferrieres*, FLORUS, deacon of *Lyons*, REMI, archbiſhop of the ſame city, with his whole church, all theſe eminent and illuſtrious eccleſiaſtics, with many others whom it would be tedious to mention, pleaded with the utmoſt zeal and vehemence, both in their writings and in their diſcourſe, the cauſe of this unhappy monk, and of his condemned opinions. Some indeed confined themſelves principally to the defence of his perſon and conduct; while others went farther, and employed all their zeal, and all their labour, in the vindication of his doctrine. On the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion were HINCMAR, his unrighteous judge, AMALARIUS, the celebrated JOHANNES SCOTUS, and others, who all maintained that GODESCHALCUS and his opinions had received the treatment they deſerved. As the ſpirit of controverſy ran high between theſe contending parties, and grew more vehement from day to day, CHARLES the BALD ſummoned a new council, or ſynod, which met at *Quiercy* A. D. 853, in which, by the credit and influence of HINCMAR, the decrees of the former council were confirmed, and

of

CENT. IX. PART II.

of conſequence GODESCHALCUS again condemned. But the decrees of this council were declared null, and deciſions of a different kind, by which GODESCHALCUS and his doctrine were vindicated and defended, were ſubſtituted in their place in a council aſſembled at *Valence* in *Dauphiney*, A. D. 855. This council was compoſed of the clergy of three provinces, *Lyons*, *Vienne*, and *Arles*, with REMI, archbiſhop of *Lyons*, at their head, and its decrees were confirmed, in the year 859, by the council of *Langres*, in which the ſame clergy were aſſembled, and in 860, by the council of *Touſi*, in which the biſhops of fourteen provinces ſupported the cauſe of the perſecuted monk, whoſe death diminiſhed conſiderably the heat of this intricate controverſy [*p*].

What judgment we are to form of this controverſy.

XXIV. If we attend to the merits of this cauſe, we ſhall find that the debate ſubſiſts ſtill in all its force, and that the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS has in our days both able defenders and powerful adverſaries. He undoubtedly maintained a twofold predeſtination, one to everlaſting life, and the other to eternal death. He held alſo, "that God did not deſire or will the ſalvation "of all mankind, but that of the elect only; and "that CHRIST did not ſuffer death for the whole "human race, but for that part of it only whom "God has predeſtinated to eternal ſalvation." Theſe deciſions, which carry a ſevere and rigorous aſpect, are ſoftly and favourably interpreted

[*p*] Beſides the common writers, who ſpeak of this controverſy, the curious reader will do well to conſult the more learned and impartial accounts he will find of it in CÆSAR EGASSE DE BOULAY'S *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 178.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part II. p. xlvii.—*Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 352.—USSERII *Hiſtoria Godeſchalchi*, *Hanoviæ* 1662, in 8vo, et *Dublini* 1661, in 4to.—GERHARD. JOH. VOSSII *Hiſtoria Pelagiana*, lib. vii. cap. iv.—Add Jo. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. iii. 210.

by

by the followers of GODESCHALCUS. They deny, for example, that their leader repreſents God as *predeſtinating* to a neceſſary courſe of iniquity, thoſe whom he has previouſly *predeſtinated* to eternal miſery, and, according to them, the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS amounts to no more than this: "That God has from all eternity doomed to ever- "laſting miſery ſuch as he *foreſaw* would go on "impenitent in a ſinful courſe, and has decreed "their ruin in conſequence of their ſins freely "committed and eternally foreſeen: that the "ſalutary effects of the mercy of God, and the "ſufferings of Chriſt, extend indeed only to the "elect, and are made good to them alone; "though this mercy and theſe ſufferings, con- "ſidered in themſelves, belong equally to all "mankind." But this contradictory jargon did not ſatisfy the adverſaries of the Predeſtinarian monk: they maintained, on the contrary, that under ambiguous terms and perplexed ſentences GODESCHALCUS had concealed the moſt enormous errors, propagating it aſſiduouſly as an article of faith, "That God had not only by an original "decree predeſtinated one part of mankind to "eternal damnation, but had alſo puſhed them "on by an irreſiſtible neceſſity, by a prepollent "force, to thoſe crimes and tranſgreſſions which "were proper to render that damnation juſt [*q*]."

Without

[*q*] The cauſe of GODESCHALCUS has been very learnedly defended by the celebrated MAGUIN, who publiſhed alſo a valuable edition, which is yet extant, of all the treatiſes that were compoſed on both ſides of this intricate controverſy. This intereſting collection, which was printed at *Paris* in the year 1650, in two volumes 4to, bears the following title: *Veterum auctorum qui Nono Sæculo de Predeſtinatione et Gratia ſcripſerunt, Opera et Fragmenta, cum Hiſtoria gemina Præfatione.* Cardinal NORIS maintained alſo the cauſe of the Predeſtinarian monk with more brevity, but leſs moderation than MAGUIN. This brief vindication may be ſeen in the *Synopſis Hiſtoriæ Godeſchalchanæ*, which is inſerted

Without determining any thing upon ſuch an intricate and incomprehenſible ſubject, with reſpect to which ſilence is the trueſt wiſdom, we ſhall only obſerve, that the private quarrels, and mutual hatred, that prevailed between RABANUS MAURUS and GODESCHALCUS, were the real ſource of the Predeſtinarian controverſy, and of all the calamities in which it involved that unfortunate monk [*r*].

Hincmar and Godeſchalcus diſpute concerning the words *Trina Deitas.*

XXV. Another, though leſs important controverſy aroſe about this time, concerning the concluding words of a very ancient hymn, which runs thus; *te, trina Deitas unaque, poſcimus*, which may be thus tranſlated, *O God, who art three, and at the ſame time but* ONE, *we beſeech thee*, &c. HINCMAR wiſely prohibited the ſinging theſe words in the churches that were under his juriſdiction, from a perſuaſion that they tended to introduce into the minds of the multitude notions inconſiſtent with the unity and ſim-

ſerted in the 4th volume of the works of that cardinal, p. 677. All the Benedictines, Janſeniſts, and Auguſtin monks maintain, almoſt without exception, that GODESCHALCUS was moſt unjuſtly perſecuted and oppreſſed by RABANUS MAURUS. The jeſuits are of a different opinion; they aſſert in general, and LOURS CELLOT, one of their order, has in a more particular manner laboured to demonſtrate in his *Hiſtoria Godeſchalci Predeſtinationis*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 1655, that the monk in queſtion was juſtly condemned and deſervedly puniſhed.

[*r*] The parents of GODESCHALCUS conſecrated him to God, by devoting him from his infancy, as was the cuſtom of the times, to the monaſtic life in the monaſtery of *Fulda*. The young monk, however, being arrived at a certain age, ſeemed much diſpoſed to abandon his retreat, to ſhake off his religious fetters, and return again into ſociety; but he was prevented from the execution of this purpoſe by RABANUS MAURUS, who kept him, againſt his will, in his monaſtic bonds. Hence a violent conteſt aroſe between theſe two eccleſiaſtics, in which LEWIS the MEEK was obliged to interpoſe, and hence the furious diſputes concerning predeſtination and grace. See *Centuriæ Magdeb. Cent.* ix. c. 10.—MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. ii. *ad A.* 829. p. 523.

plicity of the Supreme Being, and might lead them to imagine that there were three Gods. But the Benedictine monks refuſed to obey this mandate, and BERTRAM, who was one of the moſt eminent of that order, wrote a large book to prove the expreſſion *trina Deitas*, or *threefold Deity*, orthodox, from the authority of fathers, which was eſteemed the only criterion of truth in theſe miſerable times. GODESCHALCUS, who now lay in priſon, heard of this diſpute, entered warmly into it, and in a laboured diſſertation ſupported the cauſe of his Benedictine brethren, on which account HINCMAR accuſed him of *tritheiſm*, and drew up a treatiſe to prove the charge, and to refute that impious and enormous hereſy. This controverſy, however, was but of a ſhort duration, and the exceptionable paſſage of the hymn in queſtion maintained its credit, notwithſtanding all the efforts of HINCMAR, and continued, as before, to be ſung in the churches [*s*].

The manner of Chriſt's birth becomes a ſubject of debate.

XXVI. A vain curioſity, and not any deſign of promoting uſeful knowledge and true piety, was the main ſource of the greateſt part of the controverſies that were carried on in this century. And it was more eſpecially this idle curioſity, carried to an indecent and moſt extravagant length, that gave riſe to the controverſy *Concerning the manner in which Chriſt was born of the Virgin*, which began in *Germany*, and made its way from thence into *France*. Certain Germans maintained, that JESUS proceeded from his mother's womb in a manner quite different from thoſe general and uniform laws of nature that regulate the birth of the human ſpecies; which opinion was no ſooner known in *France* than it was warmly oppoſed by the famous RATRAMN, who wrote a book expreſsly

[*s*] There is an account of this controverſy given by the writers of the life, actions, and doctrines of GODESCHALCUS.

CENT. IX. PART II.

preſsly to prove that CHRIST entered into the world in the very ſame way with other mortals, and that his Virgin-mother bare him, as other women bring forth their offspring. PASCASIUS RADBERT, who was conſtantly employed either in inventing or patronizing the moſt extravagant fancies, adopted the opinion of the German doctors, and compoſed an elaborate treatiſe to prove that CHRIST was born, without his mother's womb being opened, in the ſame manner as he came into the chamber where his diſciples were aſſembled after his reſurrection, though the door was ſhut. He alſo charged thoſe who held the opinion of RATRAMN with denying the virginity of MARY. This fruitleſs diſpute was ſoon huſhed, and gave place to controverſies of ſuperior moment [*t*].

The firſt controverſy between the Greeks and Latins on the account of Photius.

XXVII. Of all the controverſies that divided Chriſtians in this century, the moſt intereſting, though at the ſame time the moſt lamentable, was that which occaſioned the fatal ſchiſm between the Greek and Latin churches. A vindictive and jealous ſpirit of animoſity and contention had, for a long time, prevailed between the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, and had ſometimes broke out into acts of violence and rage. The ambition and fury of theſe contending prelates grew ſtill more keen and vehement about the time of LEO the Iſaurian, when the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, ſeconded by the power and authority of the emperors, withdrew from the juriſdiction of the Roman pontifs many provinces, over which they had hitherto exerciſed a ſpiritual dominion [*u*]. But in this century they aroſe to an

[*t*] See LUCAS DACHERIUS, his *Spicilegium veterum Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 396.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part II. p. 51.

[*u*] See GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 535. 646.—PETR. DE MARCA, *De concordia ſacerdotii et imperii*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 6.—LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 96.

enormous

enormous height, and broke forth into a moſt dreadful flame, in the year 858 [w], when the learned PHOTIUS was choſen patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, by the emperor MICHAEL, in the place of IGNATIUS, whom that prince drove from his ſee and ſent into exile. For this violent proceeding, though it was juſtified and applauded by a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* in the year 861, was far from being attended with a general approbation. IGNATIUS appealed from this council to the Roman pontif NICOLAS I., who eſpouſed his intereſts, and, in a council aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 862, excommunicated PHOTIUS as unlawfully elected; and his abettors for having been concerned in ſuch an unrighteous cauſe The new patriarch, however, was ſo far from being terrified or dejected by this excommunication, that he returned the compliment to the Roman pontif, and, in a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, in the year 866, he declared NICOLAS unworthy both of the place he held in the church, and alſo of being admitted to the communion of Chriſtians.

XXVIII. The Roman pontif alleged a ſpecious pretext for his appearing in this matter with ſuch violence, and exciting ſuch unhappy commotions in the church. This pretext was the innocence of IGNATIUS, whom, upon an accuſation of treaſon, whether true or falſe, the emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was but a mere pretext; ambition and intereſt were the true, though ſecret ſprings, that directed the motions of NICOLAS, who would have borne with patience, nay, beheld with indifference the unjuſt ſufferings of IGNATIUS, could he

☞[w] In the original there ſtands 852, but as this is probably an error of the preſs, the tranſlator has taken the liberty to correct it in the text.

but

CENT. IX. PART II.

but have recovered from the Greeks the provinces of *Illyricum*, *Macedonia*, *Epirus*, *Achaia*, *Theſſaly*, and *Sicily*, which the emperor and PHOTIUS had removed from the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif. Before he engaged in the cauſe of IGNATIUS, he ſent a ſolemn embaſſy to *Conſtantinople* to demand the reſtitution of theſe provinces; but his demand was rejected with contempt. And hence, under pretence of avenging the injuries committed againſt IGNATIUS, he indulged without reſtraint his own private reſentment, and thus covered with the maſk of juſtice the fury of diſappointed ambition and avarice.

A ſecond conteſt concerning the ſame perſon. Photius degraded.

XXIX. While things were in this troubled ſtate, and the flame of controverſy was growing more violent from day to day, BASILIUS the Macedonian, who, by the murder of his predeceſſor, had paved his way to the imperial throne, calmed at once theſe tumults, and reſtored peace to the church, by recalling IGNATIUS from exile to the high ſtation from which he had been degraded, and by confining PHOTIUS in a monaſtery. This imperial act of authority was ſolemnly approved and confirmed by a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* in the year 869, in which the legates of the Roman pontif ADRIAN II. had great influence, and were treated with the higheſt marks of diſtinction [*x*]. The Latins acknowledge this aſſembly as the VIIIth *œcumenical* council, and in it the religious conteſts between them and the Greeks were concluded, or at leaſt huſhed and ſuſpended. But the controverſy concerning the authority of the Roman pontifs, the limits of their ghoſtly empire, and particularly their juriſdiction in *Bulgaria*, ſtill ſubſiſted; nor could all the

[*x*] The writers, on both ſides of this controverſy, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibl. Græca*, vol. iv. c. xxxviii. p. 372.

efforts

efforts of papal ambition engage either IGNATIUS or the emperor to give up *Bulgaria*, or any other province, to the ſee of *Rome*. CENT. IX. PART II.

XXX. The conteſt that had ariſen between the Greeks and Latins concerning the elevation of PHOTIUS, was of ſuch a nature as to admit of an eaſy and effectual remedy. But the haughty and ambitious ſpirit of this learned and ingenious patriarch fed the flame of diſcord inſtead of extinguiſhing it, and unhappily perpetuated the troubles and diviſions of the Chriſtian church. In the year 866, he added to the ſee of *Conſtantinople* the province of *Bulgaria*, with which the pontif NICOLAS had formed the deſign of augmenting his own ſpiritual dominions, and was moſt bitterly provoked at miſſing his aim. PHOTIUS went yet farther; and entered into meaſures every way unworthy of his character and ſtation; for he not only ſent a circular letter to the oriental patriarchs to engage them to eſpouſe his private cauſe, as the public and momentous cauſe of the church, but drew up a moſt violent charge of hereſy againſt the Roman biſhops, who had been ſent among the new-converted Bulgarians, and againſt the church of *Rome* in general. The articles of corrupt doctrine, or hereſy, which this imperious and exaſperated prelate brought againſt the Romans, were as follow: *Firſt*, That they faſted on the *Sabbath*, or ſeventh day of the week. *Secondly*, That in the firſt week of Lent they permitted the uſe of milk and cheeſe. *Thirdly*, That they prohibited their prieſts to marry, and ſeparated from their wives ſuch as were married, when they went into orders [*y*]. *Fourthly*, That they maintained

[*y*] PHOTIUS attributes to this forced and unnatural celibacy of the clergy that multitude of children whoſe fathers were unknown. Remarkable to this purpoſe is the following paſſage from a book of ALVARUS DELAGIUS, biſhop of *Sylva*

CENT. IX. PART II.

maintained that the biſhops alone were authoriſed to anoint with the holy chriſm baptized perſons, and that they, of conſequence, who had been anointed by preſbyters, were obliged to receive that unction a ſecond time from the hand of a biſhop. *Laſtly*, That they had adulterated the ſymbol or creed of *Conſtantinople*, by adding to it the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the ſon*, and were therefore of opinion that the HOLY SPIRIT did not proceed from the Father only, but alſo from the ſon [z]. NICOLAS I., finding the Roman church thus attacked, ſent the articles of this accuſation to HINCMAR and the other Gallican biſhops in the year 867, deſiring them to aſſemble their reſpective ſuffragans in order to examine and anſwer the reproach of PHOTIUS. Purſuant to this exhortation of the pontif, ODO, AENEAS, and ADO, biſhops of *Beauvais*, *Paris*, and *Vienne*, as alſo the celebrated RATRAMN, ſtept forth gallantly into the field of controverſy againſt the Greeks, anſwered one by one the accuſations of PHOTIUS, and employed the whole force of their erudition and zeal in maintaining the cauſe of the Latin churches [a].

Sylva in *Portugal*, *De Planctu Eccleſiæ*; *It were to be wiſhed*, ſays he, *that the clergy had never vowed chaſtity, eſpecially the clergy of* Spain, *where the ſons of the laity are not much more numerous than the ſons of the clergy.*

[z] See the letter of PHOTIUS in the collection publiſhed by biſhop MONTAGUE, N. II. p. 47. Other writers mention ten heads of accuſation brought againſt PHOTIUS, but ſuch do not diſtinguiſh between the firſt and ſecond controverſy that aroſe between the Greeks and Latins, and they add to the articles, with which this patriarch was charged, thoſe that were drawn up in the time of MICHAEL CERULARIUS. Certain it is, that in the epiſtle of PHOTIUS, which relates only to the firſt controverſy, and is the only criterion by which we ought to judge of it, there are no more heads of accuſation than the five which we have enumerated in the text.

[a] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Bened.* part II. p. 55.

XXXI.

XXXI. Upon the death of IGNATIUS, which happened in the year 878, the emperor took PHOTIUS into favour, and placed him again at the head of the Greek church in the patriarchal dignity from whence he had fallen. This reſtoration of the degraded patriarch was agreed to by the Roman pontif JOHN VIII., upon condition, however, that PHOTIUS would permit the Bulgarians to come under the juriſdiction of the ſee of *Rome*. The latter promiſed to ſatisfy in this the demands of the pontif, to which the emperor alſo ſeemed to conſent [*b*]; and hence it was that JOHN VIII. ſent legates to the council which was held at *Conſtantinople* A. D. 879, by whom he declared his approbation of the acts of that aſſembly, and acknowledged PHOTIUS as his brother in CHRIST. The promiſes, however, of the emperor and the patriarch were far from being accompliſhed; for after this council the former, moſt probably by the advice, or at leaſt with the conſent of the latter, refuſed to transfer the province of *Bulgaria* to the Roman pontif; and it muſt be confeſſed that this refuſal was founded upon moſt weighty and important reaſons. The pontif, notwithſtanding, was highly irritated at this diſappointment, and ſent MARINUS to *Conſtantinople* in the character of legate, to declare that he had changed his mind concerning PHOTIUS, and that he entirely approved of the ſentence of excommunication that had been formerly given againſt him. The legate, upon delivering this diſagreeable meſſage, was caſt into priſon by the emperor, but was afterwards ſet free; and being raiſed to the Pontificate upon the death of JOHN VIII., recalled the remembrance of this injurious treatment, and levelled a new ſentence of condemnation againſt PHOTIUS.

Reſtored to his ſee.

[*b*] MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 103.

CENT. IX. PART II.

XXXII. This ſentence was treated with contempt by the haughty patriarch; but about ſix years after this period, he experienced anew the fragility of ſublunary grandeur and elevation, by a fall which concluded his proſperous days. For in the year 886, LEO, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, the ſon and ſucceſſor of BASILIUS, depoſed him from the patriarchal ſee, and confined him in an Armenian monaſtery, where he died in the year 891. The death of PHOTIUS, who was the only author of the ſchiſms that divided the Greeks and Latins, might have been an occaſion of removing theſe unhappy conteſts, and of reſtoring peace and concord in the church, if the Roman pontifs had not been regardleſs of the demands of equity, as well as of the duty of Chriſtian moderation. But theſe imperious lords of the church indulged their vindictive zeal beyond all meaſure, and would be ſatisfied with nothing leſs than the degradation of all the prieſts and biſhops, who had been ordained by PHOTIUS. The Greeks, on the other hand, were ſhocked at the arrogance of theſe unjuſt pretenſions, and would not ſubmit to them on any conditions. Hence a ſpirit of reſentment and irritation renewed the ſpirit of diſpute, which had been happily declining; religious, as well as civil conteſts were again ſet on foot; new controverſies were added to the old, until the fatal ſchiſm took place, which produced a laſting and total ſeparation between the Greek and Latin church.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

I. THAT religious rites and ceremonies were multiplied from day to day, appears evidently from the labours of thoſe writers who began in this century to explain to the ignorant multitude their origin, their nature, and the purpoſes they ſerved; for the multiplicity alone of theſe religious rites could render the explication of them neceſſary. JOHANNES SCOTUS, ANGELOME, REMI, or REMIGIUS, biſhop of *Auxerre*, and WALAFRIDUS STRABO, were the principal authors who diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this ſpecies of ſacred literatrue, to whom we may add AMALARIUS, many of whoſe explanations were, however, refuted by AGOBARD and FLORUS. Their works are generally entitled *De Officiis Divinis*, for in the ſtyle of this age religious ceremonies were called by that name. The labours of theſe pious and learned men in illuſtrating the *ritual* were undoubtedly undertaken with good intentions; but their utility may be well called into queſtion; and it would be bold to affirm that they were not as prejudicial to the church in ſome reſpects, as they might be advantageous to it in others. Their books afforded, indeed, a certain ſort of ſpiritual nouriſhment to the minds of chriſtians in their attendance upon public worſhip; but this nouriſhment was both coarſe and unwholeſome. The reaſons alleged for the ceremonies in vogue at this time in the church, and the purpoſes they were ſuppoſed to anſwer, were, for the moſt part, not only far-fetched, childiſh, and ridiculous, but alſo bore the ſtrongeſt marks of forgery and fiction. It is alſo farther obſervable, that

Several writers explain the origin of the rites and ceremonies now uſed in the church.

CENT. IX. PART II.

that theſe illuſtrations not only encouraged, but augmented prodigiouſly, and that to the detriment of real piety, the veneration and zeal of the multitude for external rites and ceremonies. For who would dare to refuſe their admiration and reverence to inſtitutions, which they were taught to conſider as full of the moſt myſterious wiſdom, and founded upon the moſt pious and affecting reaſons?

A general account of thoſe rites.

II. It would be endleſs to enter into an exact enumeration of the various rites and ceremonies, which were now introduced, for the firſt time, and of which ſome were adopted by the whole body of Chriſtians, and others only by certain churches. We ſhall therefore diſmiſs this matter with the general account which follows, and point out in the notes the ſources from whence the curious reader may derive a more particular knowledge of the abſurdities of this ſuperſtitious age. The carcaſes of the ſaints tranſported from foreign countries, or diſcovered at home by the induſtry and diligence of pious or deſigning prieſts, not only obliged the rulers of the church to augment the number of feſtivals or holidays already eſtabliſhed, but alſo to diverſify the ceremonies in ſuch a manner, that each ſaint might have his peculiar worſhip. And as the authority and credit of the clergy depended much upon the high notion which was generally entertained of the virtue and merit of the ſaints they had canonized, and preſented to the multitude as objects of religious veneration, it was neceſſary to amuſe and ſurpriſe the people by a variety of pompous and ſtriking ceremonies, by images and ſuch like inventions, in order to keep up and nouriſh their ſtupid admiration for the ſaintly tribe. Hence the ſplendor and magnificence that were laviſhed upon the churches in this century, and the prodigious number of coſtly pictures and images with which

which they were adorned; hence the ſtately altars, which were enriched with the nobleſt inventions of painting and ſculpture, and illuminated with innumerable tapers at noon-day; hence the multitude of proceſſions, the gorgeous and ſplendid garments of the prieſts, and the *maſſes* that were celebrated in honour of the ſaints [c]. Among other novelties, the feaſt of *All Saints* was added, in this century, by GREGORY IV., to the Latin calendar [d]; and the feſtival of St. MICHAEL, which had been long kept with the greateſt marks of devotion and reſpect by the Orientals and Italians, began now to be obſerved more zealouſly and univerſally among the Latin Chriſtians [e].

Superſtition inſinuates itſelf into the tranſactions of civil life.

III. Nor was it only in the ſolemn acts of religious worſhip that ſuperſtition reigned with an unlimited ſway; its influence extended even to the affairs of private life, and was obſervable in the civil tranſactions of men, particularly among the Latin Chriſtians, who retained with more obſtinacy than the Greeks a multitude of cuſtoms, which derived their origin from the ſacred rites of paganiſm. The barbarous nations, which were converted to Chriſtianity, could not ſupport the thoughts of abandoning altogether the laws and manners of their anceſtors, however inconſiſtent they might be with the indiſpenſable demands of the goſpel; nay, they perſuaded, on the contrary, the Chriſtians among whom they lived to imitate their extravagant ſuperſtition in this reſpect. And this was the true and original ſource of thoſe barbarous inſtitutions that pre-

[c] See Jo. FECHTII *Liber Singularis de Miſſis in honorem Sanctorum.*

[d] See MABILLON, *De re Diplomatica*, p. 537.

[e] The holidays, or feſtivals of the ſaints were as yet but few in number among the Latins, as appears from a poem of FLORUS, publiſhed by MARTENE in the fifth volume of his *Theſaurus Anecdotor.* p. 595.

vailed among the Latins, during this and the following century, ſuch as the various methods by which it was uſual for perſons accuſed to prove their innocence in doubtful caſes, either by the trial of cold water [*f*], by ſingle combat [*g*], by the

☞ [*f*] All theſe were preſumptuous attempts to force the divine providence to declare itſelf miraculouſly in favour of the truth. In the trial of *cold water*, the perſon accuſed had the right foot and the left hand bound together, and was, in this poſture, thrown naked into the water. If he ſunk, he was acquitted; but if he floated upon the ſurface, this was conſidered as an evidence of guilt. The moſt reſpectable authors, ancient and modern, attribute the invention of this ſuperſtitious trial to pope EUGENIUS II. and it is ſomewhat ſurpriſing that Mr. BOWER has taken no notice of it in his hiſtory of that pontif. BALUZIUS has inſerted, in the ſecond volume of his *Capitularia*, the ſolemn forms of prayer and proteſtation, that EUGENIUS had cauſed to be drawn up as an introduction to this ſuperſtitious practice, and FLEURY and SPANHEIM look upon that pontif as its firſt inventor. On the other hand, father LE BRUN, a prieſt of the oratory, maintains (in his *Hiſtoire Critique des Pratiques Superſtitieuſes*, tom. ii. p. 140, &c. *edit. d'Amſterdam)*, that this cuſtom was much more ancient than EUGENIUS, and his reaſons are not unworthy of attention. Be that as it may, this cuſtom was condemned and abrogated at the requeſt, or rather, by the authority of LEWIS the MEEK about the year 829. It was however revived afterwards, and was practiſed in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, as we ſhall ſee in the progreſs of this hiſtory. For an account of the trial of *cold water*, Dr. MOSHEIM refers us, in a note, to MABILLON's *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. i. p. 47. and ROYE's *De miſſis dominicis*, p. 152.

The trial by *duel*, or ſingle combat, was introduced towards the concluſion of the fifth century by GONDEBAUD, king of the Burgundians, after that the abuſe of oaths had occaſioned the moſt horrible perjuries, and opened a door to all ſorts of injuſtice. The *duel* was then added to the oath by GONDEBAUD; the ſucceſsful combatant was ſuppoſed to be in the right, and this barbarous teſt of truth and juſtice was, in ſpite of humanity and common ſenſe, adopted by the Lombards, French, and Germans, and derived from them to other nations. It was prohibited firſt in the year 855, in the third council of *Valence* in *Dauphiny*.

The *fire ordeal* was practiſed in various ways. The accuſed either held a burning ball of iron in his hand, or was obliged to walk bare-foot upon heated plow-ſhares, whoſe number was

the fire ordeal [*b*], and by the croſs [*i*]. It is no longer a queſtion in our days, from whence theſe methods of deciding dubious caſes and accuſations

increaſed in proportion to the number or enormity of the crimes imputed to him; and ſometimes a glove of red-hot iron was uſed on this occaſion, as we ſee in the tenth book of the hiſtory of *Denmark*, by SAXON the *Grammarian*. If in theſe trials the perſon impeached remained unhurt, and diſcovered no ſigns of pain, he was diſcharged as innocent; otherwiſe he was puniſhed as guilty. The firſt account we have of Chriſtians appealing to this kind of trial as a proof of their innocence, is that of SIMPLICIUS, biſhop of *Autun*, who lived in the fourth century. This prelate, as the ſtory goes, before his promotion to the epiſcopal order, had married a wife who loved him tenderly, and who, unwilling to quit him after his advancement, continued to ſleep in the ſame chamber with her ſpouſe. The ſanctity of SIMPLICIUS ſuffered, at leaſt in the voice of fame, by the conſtancy of his wife's affection, and it was rumoured about, that the holy man, though a biſhop, perſiſted in oppoſition to the eccleſiaſtical canons to taſte the ſweets of matrimony. Upon which the dame, in preſence of a great concourſe of people, took up a conſiderable quantity of burning coals, which ſhe held in her cloaths, and applied to her breaſt, without the leaſt hurt to her perſon or damage to her garments, as the legend ſays, and her example being followed by her huſband with like ſucceſs, the ſilly multitude admired the miracle, and proclaimed the innocence of the loving pair. BRICIUS, or St. BRICE (whom Mr. COLLIER, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. p. 231, repreſents by miſtake as the firſt chriſtian who endeavoured to clear himſelf in this way) played a trick of much the ſame nature in the fifth century.

The trial by the *croſs* was made by obliging the contending parties to ſtretch out their arms, and he that continued the longeſt in this poſture gained his cauſe.

[*g*] Jo. LOCCENII *Antiquit. Suco-Gothicæ*, lib. ii. cap. vii, viii. p. 144. This barbarous method of deciding controverſies by *duel* was practiſed even by the clergy. See JUST. HEN. BOEMERI *Jus Eccleſ. Proteſtantium*, tom. v. p. 88.

[*h*] PETR. LAMBECIUS, *Rerum Hamburg.* lib. ii. p. 39.—USSERII *Sylloge Epiſtol. Hibernic.* p. 81.—JOHNSON, *Leges Eccleſ. Britanniæ.*—MICHEL DE LA ROCHE, *Memoires Litter. de la Grande Bretagne*, tom. viii. p. 391.

[*i*] See AGOBARDUS, *Contra Judicium Dei*, tom. i. opp. et *Contra legem Gundobadi*, cap. ix. p. 114. HIER. BIGNONIUS, *Ad formulas Marculphi*, cap. xii. BALUZIUS, *Ad Agobardum*, p. 104.

derived

CENT. IX. PART II.

derived their origin; all agree that they were mere deluſions, drawn from the barbarous rites of paganiſm [*k*], and not only oppoſite to the precepts of the goſpel, but abſolutely deſtructive of the ſpirit of true religion. The pontifs, however, and the inferior clergy encouraged theſe odious ſuperſtitions, and went ſo far as to accompany the practice of them with the celebration of the Lord's ſupper and other rites, in order to give them a chriſtian aſpect, and to recommend them to the veneration and confidence of the multitude.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

The ancient ſects ſtill in being.

I. THE ſects, that had ſprung up in the earlier ages of the church, ſubſiſted ſtill, without almoſt any change in their ſituations or circumſtances that is worthy of mention. Such of them as were conſiderably numerous, fixed their ſettlements beyond the limits both of the Greek and Latin empires, and thus out of the reach of their enemies. The Neſtorians more eſpecially, and the Monophyſites, ſecure under the protection of the Arabians, were extremely induſtrious in maintaining their credit, and alſo

[*k*] STRABO tells us in the fifth book of his *Geography*, that while the ſacred rites of the goddeſs *Feronia* were celebrated in a grove not far from mount *Soracte*, ſeveral perſons, tranſported with the imaginary preſence of this pretended divinity, fell into fits of enthuſiaſm, and walked bare-footed over heaps of burning coals without receiving the leaſt damage. The hiſtorian adds, that a ſpectacle ſo extraordinary drew a prodigious concourſe of people to this annual ſolemnity. PLINY relates ſomething of the ſame nature concerning the *Hirpii*. See his *Nat. Hiſt.* book vii. ch. ii.

diſcovered a warm and active zeal in the propagation of Chriſtianity among thoſe who were yet unacquainted with that divine religion. Some learned men are of opinion, that it was only in this century that the Abyſſinians or Ethiopians embraced the ſentiments of the Monophyſites, in conſequence of the exhortations addreſſed to them by the doctors of that ſect who reſided in *Egypt*. But this is undoubtedly a wrong account of the matter; for it is certain, that the Abyſſinians, who were accuſtomed to receive their ſpiritual guide from the biſhop of *Alexandria*, commenced Monophyſites in the ſeventh century, if not ſooner. For in that period the Arabians made themſelves maſters of *Egypt*, oppreſſed the Greeks, and granted to the Monophyſites ſuch a powerful protection, as enabled them to reduce under their juriſdiction almoſt all the churches that had been eſtabliſhed in *Egypt* [*l*].

The Paulicians.

II. The Greeks, during the greateſt part of this century, were engaged in a moſt bitter controverſy, or, to ſpeak more properly, in a bloody and barbarous war with the Paulicians, a ſect that may be conſidered as a branch of the Manichæans, and which reſided principally in *Armenia*. This pernicious ſect is ſaid to have been formed in *Armenia* by two brothers PAUL and JOHN, ſons of CALLINICES, and inhabitants of *Samoſatena*, from the former of whom it derives its name; though others are of opinion, that the Paulicians were ſo called from another PAUL, an Armenian by birth, who lived under the reign of JUSTINIAN II. [*m*] Be that as it may, a certain zealot called CONSTANTINE received, in the ſeventh century,

[*l*] *Nouveaux Memoires de la Compagnie de Jeſus dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 283, 284.—LE GRAND, *Diſſert.* iv.—LOBO, *Voyage Hiſtorique de l'Abyſſinie*, tom. ii. p. 18.

[*m*] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 74. *in* B. WOLFII. *Anecdotis Græcis*, tom. i.

under

CENT. IX. PART II.

under the government of CONSTANS, this drooping faction, which had suffered deeply from the violence of its adversaries, and was ready to expire under the severity of the imperial edicts, and of those penal laws which were executed against its adherents with the utmost rigour. CONSTANS, JUSTINIAN II., and LEO the Isaurian, exerted their zeal against the Paulicians with a peculiar degree of bitterness and fury, and left no method of oppression unemployed, no means of accomplishing their ruin that were not put in execution; but their efforts were ineffectual, nor could all their power, nor all their barbarity, exhaust the patience, or conquer the obstinacy of that inflexible people, who, with a fortitude worthy of a better cause, made light of the calamities to which their erroneous doctrine exposed them. The face of things changed, however, to their advantage towards the commencement of this century, and their affairs carried a more prosperous aspect under the protection of the emperor NICEPHORUS, who favoured them in a particular manner, and restored to them their civil privileges, as well as their religious liberty [*n*].

Persecuted anew.

III. Their tranquillity, however, was but of short duration; it was a transient scene that was soon to be succeeded by yet more dreadful sufferings than they had hitherto experienced. The cruel rage of persecution, which had for some years been suspended, broke forth with redoubled violence under the reigns of MICHAEL CUROPALATES, and LEO the Armenian, who caused the strictest search to be made after the Paulicians in all the provinces of the Grecian empire, and inflicted capital punishment upon such of them as refused to return to the bosom of the church.

[*n*] See GEORG. CEDRENUS, *Compend. Historiar.* tom. ii. p. 480. *Edit. Paris.* p. 379.

This

This rigorous decree turned the affliction of the Paulicians, who dwelt in *Armenia*, into vengeance, and drove them into the moſt deſperate meaſures. They maſſacred THOMAS, biſhop of *New Cæſarea*, and alſo the magiſtrates and judges which the emperors had eſtabliſhed in *Armenia*; and after avenging themſelves thus cruelly, they took refuge in the countries that were governed by the Saracens, and from thence infeſted the neighbouring ſtates of *Greece* with perpetual incurſions [o]. After theſe reciprocal acts of cruelty and vengeance, the Paulicians, as it would ſeem, enjoyed an interval of tranquillity, and returned to their habitations in the Grecian provinces.

The fate of the Paulicians under Theodora.

IV. But the moſt dreadful ſcene of perſecution and bloodſhed that was exhibited againſt theſe wretched heretics, aroſe from the furious and inconſiderate zeal of the empreſs THEODORA. This impetuous woman, who was regent of the empire during the minority of her ſon, iſſued out a decree, which placed the Paulicians in the perplexing alternative either of abandoning their principles, or of periſhing by fire and ſword. The decree was ſevere, but the cruelty with which it was put in execution by thoſe who were ſent into *Armenia* for that purpoſe, was horrible beyond expreſſion; for theſe miniſters of wrath, after confiſcating the goods of above an hundred thouſand of that miſerable people, put their poſſeſſors to death in the moſt barbarous manner, and made them expire ſlowly in a variety of the moſt exquiſite tortures. Such as eſcaped deſtruction fled for protection and refuge to the Saracens, who received them with compaſſion and humanity, and permitted them to build a city for their reſidence, which was called *Tibrica*. Upon this they entered

[o] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 125. PETRI SICULI *Hiſtoria Manichæorum*, p. 71.

into

into a league with the Saracens, and, chuſing for their chief an officer of the greateſt reſolution and valour, whoſe name was CARBEAS, they declared againſt the Greeks a war which was carried on with the utmoſt vehemence and fury. This bloody war continued during this whole century; the victory ſeemed often doubtful, but the ſlaughter was terrible, and the numbers that periſhed on both ſides prodigious. Many of the Grecian provinces felt, in a more particular manner, the dire effects of this cruel conteſt, and exhibited the moſt moving ſcenes of deſolation and miſery [*p*]. During theſe commotions, ſome Paulicians, towards the concluſion of this century, ſpread abroad among the Bulgarians their peſtilential doctrines, which were received with docility, and took root ſpeedily, as might naturally be expected, among a barbarous people that were

[*p*] GEORG. CEDRENUS, *Compend. Hiſt.* p. 541. *Ed. Pariſ.* p. 425. *Ed. Venet.* p. 547, et 429, &c. ZONARAS, *Annal.* lib. xvi. tom. ii. p. 122. *Ed. Venet.* The principal authors who have given accounts of the Paulicians are PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, and PETRUS SICULUS, whoſe hiſtory of the Manichæans was publiſhed in Greek and Latin at *Ingoldſtadt*, in 1604, by MATTH. RADERUS. By the account of PETRUS SICULUS that is given by himſelf, we learn that in the year 870, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, he was ſent ambaſſador to the Paulicians at *Tibrica*, to treat with them concerning the exchange of priſoners, and lived among them during the ſpace of nine months; this is ſufficient to give us a high idea of the power and proſperity of the Paulicians at that time. It is from this eminent writer that CEDRENUS ſeems to have taken what he has advanced in his *Compend. Hiſtor.* p. 431. What we learn concerning the Paulicians from more modern writers, ſuch as BAYLE, in his *Dictionary*, and B. Jo. CHRIST. WOLFIUS, in his *Manichæiſmus ante Manichæos*, p. 247, ſeems to be derived from BOSSUET's *Hiſtoire des Variations des Egliſes Proteſtantes*, tom. ii. p. 129. But this authority is highly exceptionable; for BOSSUET himſelf did not conſult the true ſources of knowledge upon this point; and, what is ſtill worſe, the ſpirit of party ſeems manifeſtly to have led him into *voluntary* errors.

but

but lately made converts to the Chriſtian faith [*q*].

CENT. IX. PART II.

V. The Greeks treated the Paulicians, of whom we have been now ſpeaking, as Manichæans; though, if we may credit the teſtimony of PHOTIUS, the Paulicians expreſſed the utmoſt abhorrence of MANES and his doctrine [*r*]. Moſt evident it is, that they were not altogether Manichæans, though they embraced ſome opinions that reſembled certain tenets of that abominable ſect. They had not, like the Manichæans, an eccleſiaſtical government adminiſtered by biſhops, prieſts, and deacons: they had no ſacred order of men diſtinguiſhed by their manner of life, their habit, or any other circumſtance from the reſt of the aſſembly: nor had councils, ſynods, or ſuch like inſtitutions any place in their religious polity. They had certain doctors whom they called *Sunecdemi*, i. e. companions in the journey of life, and alſo *Notarii*. Among theſe there reigned a perfect equality, and they had no peculiar rights, privileges, nor any external mark of dignity to diſtinguiſh them from the people [*s*]. The only ſingularity that attended their promotion to the rank of doctors was, that they changed their lay-names for ſcripture ones, as if there had been ſomething peculiarly venerable in the names of the holy men, whoſe lives and actions are recorded

Whether or not the Paulicians were Manichæans.

[*q*] It is not improbable that there are yet in *Thrace* and *Bulgaria*, Paulicians, or Paulians as they are called by ſome. It appears at leaſt certain, that in the laſt century ſome of that ſect ſtill ſubſiſted, and dwelt at *Nicopolis*, as we learn from the teſtimony of URB. CERRI, in his *Etat preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 72, who tells us, that PETER DEODATI, archbiſhop of *Sophia*, cauſed them to abandon their errors, and return to the catholic faith; but whether this latter part of the account be true or falſe, is more than we ſhall pretend to determine.

[*r*] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 17. 56. 65.—PETR. SICULUS, *Hiſt. Manich.* p. 43.

[*s*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 31, 32. PETR. SICUL. p. 44. CEDRENUS, l. c. p. 431.

in

CENT. IX. PART II.

in the ſacred writings. They received all the books of the New Teſtament, except the Two Epiſtles of St. PETER, which they rejected for reaſons unknown to us; and their copies of the Goſpel were exactly the ſame with thoſe uſed by all other Chriſtians, without the leaſt interpolation of the ſacred text; in which reſpect alſo they differed conſiderably from the Manichæans [*t*]. They moreover recommended to the people without exception, and that with the moſt affecting and ardent zeal, the conſtant and aſſiduous peruſal of the holy ſcriptures, and expreſſed the utmoſt indignation againſt the Greeks, who allowed to the prieſts alone an acceſs to theſe ſacred fountains of divine knowledge [*u*]. In explaining, however, the doctrines of the goſpel, they often departed from the literal ſenſe, and the natural ſignification of the words, and interpreted them in a forced and allegorical manner, when they oppoſed their favourite opinions and tenets [*w*]; and ſuch more eſpecially were the deluſive and erroneous explications, which they gave of what is ſaid in the goſpel concerning the inſtitutions of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, and the divine authority of the Old Teſtament, all which they obſtinately rejected. Beſides the books of the New Teſtament, they treated with a particular veneration certain epiſtles of SERGIUS, the moſt eminent and illuſtrious doctor of their ſect.

The opinions of the Paulicians.

VI. None of the Greek writers have given a complete view of the Paulician ſyſtem, which was undoubtedly compoſed of a great variety of tenets; they content themſelves with mentioning ſix monſtrous errors, which, in their eſtimation, rendered the Paulicians unworthy of enjoying either the comforts of this world, or the happi-

[*t*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 11.—PETR. SICUL. p. 19.
[*u*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 101.—PETR. SICUL. p. 57.
[*w*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 12.

neſs

neſs of the next. Theſe errors are as follows: 1. "They deny that this inferior and viſible "world is the production of the Supreme Being, "and they diſtinguiſh the creator of this world "and of human bodies from the moſt high God, "who dwells in the heavens." It was principally on account of this odious doctrine, which was, however, adopted by all the Gnoſtic ſects, that the Paulicians were looked upon as Manichæans by the Greeks. But what their ſentiments were concerning the Creator of this world, and whether or not they conſidered him as a Being diſtinct from the evil principle, are matters that no writer has hitherto explained in a ſatisfactory manner. We learn only from PHOTIUS, that, according to the Paulician doctrine, the *evil principle* was engendered by *darkneſs* and *fire*: from whence it plainly follows that he was neither ſelf-originated, nor eternal [*x*]. 2. "They treated contemptu-"ouſly the Virgin MARY;" that is to ſay, according to the manner of ſpeaking uſual among the Greeks, they refuſed to adore and worſhip her. They maintained, indeed, that CHRIST was the ſon of MARY, and was born of her (although they maintained, as appears from the ex-

[*x*] PHOTIUS, lib. ii. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 147. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the Oriental philoſophers, from whom the Gnoſtics and Manichæans derived their origin, conſidered *eternal matter* as the ſeat and ſource of all evil; but they believed at the ſame time, like many of the Gnoſtics, that this *matter*, endued from all eternity with life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, miſery, and diſorder. This principle, according to them, is the author of all material ſubſtances; while God is the creator and father of ſpirits. Theſe tenets reſemble, no doubt, the Manichæan doctrine; yet they differ from it in ſeveral points. It appears moſt probable, that the Paulicians were a branch of ſome of the ancient Gnoſtic ſects, which were extremely numerous and diverſified, and which, though perſecuted and oppreſſed from age to age in the moſt rigorous manner by many emperors, could never be entirely ſuppreſſed, nor totally extirpated.

CENT. IX. PART II.

preſs teſtimony of their adverſaries, that the divine Saviour brought with him from heaven his human nature, and that MARY, after the birth of CHRIST, had other children by JOSEPH); they only fell into the ſentiments of the Valentinians, and held that CHRIST paſſed through the womb of the Virgin, as the pure ſtream of limpid water paſſes through a conduit, and that MARY did not preſerve her virginity to the end of her days; all which aſſertions the Greeks rejected with the utmoſt antipathy and abhorrence. 3. "They refuſed to celebrate the holy inſtitution of the "Lord's ſupper;" for as they looked upon many precepts and injunctions of the goſpel to be of a merely figurative and parabolical nature, ſo they underſtood by the bread and wine, which CHRIST is ſaid to have adminiſtered to his diſciples at his laſt ſupper, the divine diſcourſes and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a ſpiritual food and nouriſhment to the ſoul, and fill it with repoſe, ſatisfaction, and delight [*y*]. 4. "They loaded "the croſs of CHRIST with contempt and re"proach;" by which we are only to underſtand, that they refuſed to follow the abſurd and ſuperſtitious practice of the Greeks, who paid to the pretended wood of the croſs a certain ſort of religious homage. As the Paulicians believed that CHRIST was cloathed with an etherial, impaſſible, and celeſtial body, they could by no means grant that he was *really* nailed to the croſs, or that he expired, in effect, upon that ignominious tree: and hence naturally aroſe that treatment of the

[*y*] The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error concerning *baptiſm*; it is however certain, that the accounts of that ſacred inſtitution, which are given in ſcripture, were allegorically explained by this extravagant ſect; and PHOTIUS, in his *Firſt Book againſt the Manichæans*, p. 29. expreſsly aſſerts, that the Paulicians treated baptiſm as a mere allegorical ceremony, and by the baptiſmal water underſtood the *goſpel*.

croſs

croſs of which the Greeks accuſed them. 5. "They "rejected, after the example of the greateſt part "of the Gnoſtics, the books of the Old Teſta- "ment, and looked upon the writers of that ſa- "cred hiſtory as inſpired by the creator of this "world, and not by the ſupreme God. 6. They "excluded preſbyters and elders from all part in "the adminiſtration of the church." By this, however, no more can be meant, than that they refuſed to call their doctors by the name of *Preſbyters*, a name which had its origin among the Jews, and was peculiar to that odious people who perſecuted JESUS CHRIST, and attempted, as the Paulicians ſpeak, to put him to death [z].

CENT. IX. PART II.

[z] Theſe ſix famous errors of the Paulicians I have taken from the Manichæan hiſtory of PETRUS SICULUS, with whom PHOTIUS and CEDRENUS agree, although their accounts of theſe opinions be leſs perſpicuous and diſtinct. The explanatory remarks that I have added, are the reſult of my own reflexions upon the Paulician ſyſtem, and the doctrine of the Greeks.

THE

TENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the Church during this century.

CENT. X. PART I.

The propagation of the Chriſtian religion.

I. THE deplorable ſtate of chriſtianity in this century, ariſing partly from that aſtoniſhing ignorance that gave a looſe rein both to ſuperſtition and immorality, and partly from an unhappy concurrence of cauſes of another kind, is unanimouſly lamented by the various writers, who have tranſmitted to us the hiſtory of theſe miſerable times. Yet amidſt all this darkneſs ſome gleams of light were perceived from time to time, and ſeveral occurrences happened, which deſerve a place in the proſperous annals of the church. The Neſtorians in *Chaldæa* extended their ſpiritual conqueſts beyond mount *Imaus*, and introduced the Chriſtian religion into *Tartary*, properly ſo called, whoſe inhabitants had hitherto lived in their natural ſtate of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and ſavage. The ſame ſucceſsful miſſionaries ſpread, by degrees, the knowledge of the goſpel among that moſt powerful nation of the Turks, or Tartars, which went by the name

name of *Karit*, and bordered on *Kathay*, or on the northern part of *China* [*a*]. The laborious induſtry of this ſect, and their zeal for the propagation of the Chriſtian faith, deſerve, no doubt, the higheſt encomiums; it muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the doctrine and worſhip, which they introduced among theſe Barbarians, were far from being, in all reſpects, conformable to the precepts of the goſpel, or to the true ſpirit and genius of the Chriſtian religion. CENT. X. PART I.

II. The prince of that country, whom the Neſtorians converted to the Chriſtian faith, aſſumed, if we may give credit to the vulgar tradition, the name of JOHN after his baptiſm, to which he added the ſurname of *Preſbyter*, from a principle of modeſty. Hence it was, as ſome learned men imagine, that the ſucceſſors of this monarch retained theſe names until the time of GENGIS KAN, who flouriſhed in the fourteenth century, and were each of them called PRESTER JOHN [*b*]. But all this has a very fabulous air; at leaſt it is advanced without any ſolid proof; nay, it appears evident, on the contrary, that the famous PRESTER JOHN, who made ſo much noiſe in the world, did not begin to reign in that part of *Aſia* before the concluſion of the eleventh century. It is, however, certain beyond all contradiction, that the monarchs of the nation called *Karit*, which makes a large part of the empire of the Mogul, and is by ſome denominated a province of the Turks, and by others a tribe of the Tartars, embraced Chriſtianity in this century; and that a conſiderable part of *Tartary*, or *Aſiatic Scythia*, lived under the ſpiritual juriſdiction Preſter John.

[*a*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Bibliotheca Oriental Vatic.* tom. iii. part II. p. 482.—HERBELOT, *Bibliotheque Oriental*, p. 256.

[*b*] See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* tom. iii. part II. p. 282.

CENT. X. PART I.

of biſhops who were ſent among them by the Neſtorian pontif [*c*].

Rollo firſt duke of Normandy converted.

III. If we turn our eyes to the weſtern world, we ſhall find the goſpel making its way with more or leſs rapidity through the moſt rude and uncivilized nations. The famous arch-pirate ROLLO, ſon of a Norwegian count, being baniſhed from his native land [*d*], had, in the preceding century, put himſelf at the head of a reſolute band of Normans, and ſeized upon one of the maritime provinces of *France*, from whence he infeſted the whole country round about with perpetual incurſions and depredations. In the year 912, this valiant chief embraced, with his whole army, the Chriſtian faith, and that upon the following occaſion: CHARLES the Simple, who wanted both reſolution and power to drive this warlike and intrepid invader out of his dominions, was obliged to have recourſe to the method of negociation. He accordingly offered to make over to ROLLO a conſiderable part of his territories, upon condition that the latter would conſent to a peace, eſpouſe his daughter GISELA [*e*], and embrace Chriſtianity. Theſe terms were accepted by ROLLO without the leaſt heſitation; and his army,

[*c*] The late learned Mr. B. THEOPHILUS SIGEFRED BAYER, in his *Preface to the Muſeum Sinicum*, p. 145, informed us of his deſign to give the world an accurate account of the Neſtorian churches eſtabliſhed in *Tartary* and *China*, drawn from ſome curious ancient records and monuments, that have not been as yet made public. His work was to have been entitled *Hiſtoria Eccleſiarum Sinicarum, et Septentrionalis Aſiæ*; but death prevented the execution of this intereſting plan, and alſo of ſeveral others, which this great man had formed, and which would have undoubtedly caſt a new light upon the hiſtory of the Aſiatic Chriſtians.

[*d*] HOLBERGI *Hiſtoria Danorum Navalis in Scriptis Societat. Scient. Hafnienſ.* part III. p. 357.

☞ [*e*] Other writers more politely repreſent the offer of GISELA as one of the methods that CHARLES employed to obtain a peace with ROLLO.

following

following the example of their leader, profeſſed a religion of which they were totally ignorant [*f*]. These Norman pirates, as appears from many authentic records, were abſolutely without religion of every kind, and therefore were not reſtrained, by the power of prejudice, from embracing a religion which preſented to them the moſt advantageous proſpects. They knew no diſtinction between intereſt and duty, and they eſtimated truth and virtue only by the profits with which they were attended. It was from this ROLLO, who received at his baptiſm the name of ROBERT, that the famous line of Norman dukes derived its origin; for the province of *Bretagne*, and a part of *Neuſtria*, which CHARLES the Simple conveyed to his ſon-in-law by a ſolemn grant, were, from this time, known by the name of *Normandy* [*g*], which they derived from their new poſſeſſors.

IV. The Chriſtian religion was introduced into *Poland* by the zealous efforts of female piety. DAMBROWKA, daughter of BOLISLAUS, duke of *Bohemia*, perſuaded, by the force of repeated exhortations, her huſband MICISLAUS, duke of *Poland*, to abandon paganiſm, in conſequence of which he embraced the goſpel A. D. 965. The account of this agreeable event was no ſooner brought to *Rome*, than the pontif, JOHN XIII., ſent into *Poland* ÆGIDIUS, biſhop of *Tuſculum*, attended with a numerous train of eccleſiaſtics, in order to ſecond the pious efforts of the duke and ducheſs, who deſired, with impatience, the converſion of their ſubjects. But the exhortations and endeavours of theſe devout miſſionaries, who

The converſion of the Poliſh nation.

[*f*] BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 296.—DANIEL, *Hiſt. de France*, tom. ii. p. 587.

☞ [*g*] It was *Neuſtria* properly, and not *Bretagne*, that received the name of *Normandy*, from the Normans who choſe ROLLO for their chief.

CENT. X. PART I.

were unacquainted with the language of the people they came to inſtruct, would have been entirely without effect, had they not been accompanied with the edicts and penal laws, the promiſes and threats of MICISLAUS, which dejected the courage, and conquered the obſtinacy of the reluctant Poles. When therefore the fear of puniſhment, and the hope of reward, had laid the foundations of Chriſtianity in *Poland*, two national archbiſhops and ſeven biſhops were conſecrated to the miniſtry, whoſe zeal and labours were followed with ſuch ſucceſs, that the whole body of the people abandoned, by degrees, their ancient ſuperſtitions, and made public profeſſion of the religion of JESUS [*b*]. It was indeed no more than an external profeſſion; for that inward change of affections and principles, which the goſpel requires, was far from being an object of attention in this barbarous age.

The Chriſtian religion eſtabliſhed in Moſcovy,

V. The Chriſtian religion was eſtabliſhed in *Ruſſia* by means every way ſimilar to thoſe that had occaſioned its propagation in *Poland*; for we muſt not lay any ſtreſs upon the proſelytes that were made to Chriſtianity among the Ruſſians in the preceding century; ſince theſe converſions were neither permanent nor ſolid, and ſince it appears evidently, that ſuch of that nation, as, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, had embraced the doctrine of the Greek church, relapſed ſoon after into the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors. WLODOMIR, duke of *Ruſſia* and *Moſcovy*, married, in the year 961, ANNE, ſiſter of BASILIUS, the ſecond Grecian emperor of that name; and this zealous princeſs, by her repeated entreaties, and her pious importunity, perſuaded at length her reluctant ſpouſe to receive the Chriſt-

[*b*] DUGLOSSI *Hiſtoria Polonica*, lib. ii. p. 91. lib. iii. p. 95. 239.—REGENVOLSCII *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Slavon.* lib. i. cap. i. p. 8.—HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part I. p. 41.—SOLIGNAC, *Hiſt. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 71.

ian faith, and he was accordingly baptized, A. D. 987, aſſuming upon that occaſion the name of BASILIUS. The Ruſſians followed ſpontaneouſly the example of their prince; we have, at leaſt, no account of any compulſion or violence being employed in their converſion [*i*], and this is the true date of the entire eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity among that people. WLODOMIR and his ducheſs were placed in the higheſt order of the Ruſſian ſaints, and are ſtill worſhipped at *Kiovia*, where they lie interred, with the greateſt devotion. The Latins, however, paid no ſuch reſpect to the memory of WLODOMIR, whom they repreſent as abſolutely unworthy of ſaintly honours [*k*]. CENT. X. PART I.

VI. The Hungarians and Avari had received ſome faint notions of Chriſtianity under the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, and in conſequence of the meaſures that had been taken by that zealous prince for the propagation of the goſpel. Theſe notions, however, were ſoon and eaſily extinguiſhed by various circumſtances, which took their riſe from the death of CHARLEMAGNE; and it was not before the century, of which we now write, that the Chriſtian religion obtained a fixed ſettlement among theſe warlike nations [*l*]. Towards the middle of this century, BULOSUDES and GYVLA, or GYLAS, two Turkiſh chiefs, whoſe governments lay upon the banks of the *Danube* [*m*], made public profeſſion of Chriſtianity and were baptized at *Conſtantinople*. The former apoſtatized ſoon after to the religion of his anceſtors; and in *Hungary*.

[*i*] See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baron.* tom. iv. *ad A.* 987, p. 55. *et ad A.* 1015, p. 110. CAR. DU FRESNE, *Familiæ Byzantinæ*, *p.* 143. ed. *Pariſ.*

[*k*] DITMARUS, *Merſeb.* lib. vii. *Caronic.* p. 417. tom. i. *Scriptor. Brunſvic. Leibnitii.*

[*l*] PAULI DEBREZENI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Reformator. in Ungaria*, part I. cap. iii. p. 19.

[*m*] The Hungarians and Tranſylvanians were, at this time, known to the Grecians by the name of Turks.

while

CENT. X. PART I.

while the latter not only perſevered ſtedfaſtly in his new profeſſion, but alſo ſhewed the moſt zealous concern for the converſion of his ſubjects, who, in conſequence of his expreſs order, were inſtructed in the doctrines and precepts of the goſpel by HIEROTHEUS, a learned prelate, by whom he had been accompanied in his journey to *Conſtantinople*. SAROLTA, the daughter of GYLAS, was afterwards given in marriage to GEYSA, the chief of the Hungarian nation, whom ſhe perſuaded to embrace the divine religion in which ſhe had been educated. The faith, however, of this new-converted prince was feeble and unſteady, and he retained a ſtrong propenſity to the ſuperſtition which he had been engaged to forſake; but his apoſtaſy was prevented by the pious remonſtrances of ADALBERT, archbiſhop of *Prague*, who came into *Hungary* towards the concluſion of this century, and by whom alſo STEPHEN, the ſon of GEYSA, was baptized with great pomp and ſolemnity. It was to this young prince that the goſpel was principally indebted for its propagation and eſtabliſhment among the Hungarians, whoſe entire converſion was the fruit of his zeal for the cauſe of CHRIST. For he perfected, what his father and grandfather had only begun; fixed biſhops, with large revenues, in various places; erected magnificent temples for divine worſhip; and, by the influence of inſtructions, threatenings, rewards, and puniſhments, he brought his ſubjects, almoſt without exception, to abandon the wretched ſuperſtition of their idolatrous anceſtors. Theſe vigorous proceedings, by which STEPHEN introduced the religion of JESUS among the Hungarians, procured him the moſt diſtinguiſhed honours of ſaintſhip in ſucceeding ages [*n*].

VII. The

[*n*] The Greeks, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles, claim each for themſelves the peculiar honour of having been the founders

VII. The Chriſtian religion was in a very unſettled ſtate among the Danes under the reign of GORMON, and, notwithſtanding the protection it received from his queen, who profeſſed it publicly, was obliged to ſtruggle with many difficulties, and to encounter much oppoſition. The face of things changed, indeed, after the death of GORMON. His ſon HARALD, ſurnamed *Blaatand*, being defeated by OTHO the Great, A. D. 949, embraced the goſpel, and was baptized together with his conſort and his ſon SUENO, or SWEIN, by ADALDAGUS, archbiſhop of *Hamburgh*, or, as others alledge, by POPPON, a pious eccleſiaſtic, who attended the emperor in this expedition. It is probable that HARALD, educated by his mother TYRA, who was a Chriſtian, was not extremely averſe to the religion of JESUS; it appears, however, certain, that his converſion was leſs the effect of his own choice, than of the irreſiſtible commands of his victorious enemy. For OTHO, perſuaded that the Danes would never deſiſt from

In *Denmark.*

founders of the Chriſtian religion in *Hungary*, and their reſpective pretenſions have introduced not a little obſcurity into this matter. The Germans allege, that the Chriſtian religion was brought into *Hungary* by GISELA, ſiſter to their emperor HENRY II., who, being given in marriage to STEPHEN, the king of that nation, perſuaded that prince to embrace the goſpel. The Bohemians tell us, on the other hand, that it was by the miniſtry of ADALBERT, archbiſhop of *Prague*, that STEPHEN was converted. The Poles affirm, that GEYSA, having married a Chriſtian Princeſs of their nation, *viz.* ADELHEID, ſiſter to MICISLAS, duke of *Poland*, was induced by her remonſtrances and exhortations to make profeſſion of Chriſtianity. In conſequence of a careful examination of all theſe pretenſions, we have followed the ſentiments and deciſions of the Greek writers, after having diligently compared them with the Hungarian hiſtorians; and we are encouraged in this by the authority of the learned GABRIEL DE JUXTA HORNAD, who, in his *Initia Religionis Chriſtianæ inter Hungaros Eccleſiæ orientali aſſerta*, publiſhed at *Franckfort* in 1740, decides this queſtion in favour of the Greeks. All other accounts of the matter are extremely imperfect, and ſubject to many doubts and difficulties.

their

CENT. X. PART I.

their hoſtile incurſions and rapines, as long as they perſevered in the religion of their anceſtors, which was ſo proper to nouriſh a ferocity of temper, and to animate to military exploits, made it the principal condition of the treaty of peace, which he concluded with HARALD, that both he and his ſubjects ſhould receive the Chriſtian faith [*o*]. Upon the converſion of this prince, ADALDAGUS and POPPON employed their miniſterial labours among the Cimbrians and Danes, in order to engage them to imitate ſuch an illuſtrious example; and their exhortations were crowned with remarkable ſucceſs, to which the ſtupendous miracles performed by POPPON are ſaid to have contributed in a particular manner. Theſe miracles, indeed, were of ſuch a kind, as manifeſtly ſhews that they derived their origin from human art, and not from a divine interpoſition [*p*]. As long as HARALD lived, he uſed every wiſe and probable method of confirming his ſubjects in the religion they had embraced. For this purpoſe he eſtabliſhed biſhops in ſeveral parts of his dominions, enacted excellent laws, abrogated ſuperſtitious cuſtoms, and impoſed ſevere reſtraints upon all vicious and immoral practices. But after all theſe pious efforts, and ſalutary meaſures, which promiſed ſuch fair proſpects to the riſing church, his ſon SUENO, or SWEIN, apoſtatized from the truth, and, during a certain time, involved the Chriſtians in the deepeſt calamity

[*o*] ADAM *Brem. Hiſt.* lib. ii. cap. ii. iii. p. 16. cap. xv. p. 20. in LINDENBROGII *Scriptoribus rerum Septentrional.*—ALB. KRANZII *Wandalia*, lib. iv. cap. xx.—LUDWIGII *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptor.* tom. ix. p. 10.—PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Diplomatici*, tom. i. p. 59.

[*p*] Jo. ADOLPH. CUPRÆI *Annales Epiſcopor. Sleſvic.* cap. xiii. p. 78.—ADAM *Bremenſ.* lib. ii. cap. xxvi. p. 22. cap. xliv. p. 28.—Jo. STEPHAN. *ad Saxonem Grammat.* p. 207.—MOLLERI *Introduct. ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſ. Cimbric.* part II. cap. iii. § 14.

and

and diſtreſs, and treated them with the greateſt cruelty and injuſtice. This perſecuting tyrant felt, however, in his turn, the heavy ſtrokes of adverſity, which produced a ſalutary change in his conduct, and happily brought him to a better mind; for being driven from his kingdom, and obliged to ſeek his ſafety in a ſtate of exile among the Scots, he embraced anew the religion he had abandoned, and upon his reſtoration to his dominions, exerted the moſt ardent and exemplary zeal in the cauſe of Chriſtianity, which he endeavoured to promote to the utmoſt of his power [q]. CENT. X. PART I.

VIII. It was in this century, that the firſt dawn of the goſpel aroſe upon the Norwegians, as we learn from the moſt authentic records. The converſion of that people was attempted, in the year 933, by their monarch HAGEN ADELSTEEN, who had been educated among the Engliſh, and who employed certain eccleſiaſtics of that nation to inſtruct his ſubjects in the doctrines of Chriſtianity. But his pious efforts were rendered fruitleſs by the brutal obſtinacy, with which the Norwegians perſevered in their ancient prejudices, and the aſſiduity and zeal with which his ſucceſſor HARALD GRAUFELDT purſued the ſame plan of reformation, were alſo without effect [r]. The ſucceeding princes, far from being diſcouraged by theſe obſtacles, perſiſted firmly in their worthy purpoſe, and HACO, among others, yielding to the entreaties of HARALD, king of *Denmark*, to whom he was indebted for the Norwegian crown, embraced, himſelf, the Chriſtian religion, and recommended it, with the greateſt fervour, to his ſubjects, in an aſſembly of the people that was held in the In Norway.

[q] SAXON. *Gramm. Hiſtor. Dan.* lib. x. p. 186.—PONTOPPIDAN, *De geſtis et veſtigiis Danorum extra Daniam*, tom. ii. cap. i. § 1, 2.

[r] ERIC. PONTOPPIDAN, *Annales Eccleſ. Danicæ diplomat.* tom. i. p. 66.

year

CENT. X. PART I.

year 945 [*s*]. This recommendation, notwithstanding the ſolemnity and zeal with which it was accompanied, made little impreſſion upon the minds of this fierce and barbarous people; nor were they entirely gained over by the zealous endeavours of OLAUS to convert them to Chriſtianity, though the pious diligence of that prince, which procured him the honour of ſaintſhip, was not altogether without effect [*t*]. But that which gave the finiſhing ſtroke to the converſion of the Norwegians was their ſubjection to SUENON, or SWEIN, king of *Sweden*, who, having defeated their monarch OLAUS TRYG-GUESON, became maſter of *Norway*, and obliged its inhabitants to abandon the gods of their anceſtors, and to embrace univerſally the religion of JESUS [*u*]. Among the

[*s*] TORM. TORFÆI *Hiſtoria Norwegica*, tom. ii. p. 183. 214.

[*t*] TORFÆUS, l. c. p. 457.

☞ [*u*] Dr. MOSHEIM attributes here to SWEIN the honour which is due to his predeceſſor OLAUS TRYG-GUESON; if it can be eſteemed an honour to have promoted a rational and divine religion by compulſion and violence, by fire and ſword. OLAUS, who had abjured paganiſm in *England*, during his youth, in conſequence of a warm and pathetic diſcourſe which he had heard from a Britiſh prieſt, returned to *Norway* with a firm reſolution to propagate Chriſtianity throughout his dominions. For this purpoſe he travelled from one province to another, attended by a choſen band of ſoldiers, and ſword in hand performed the functions of miſſionary and apoſtle. His miniſtry, thus enforced, was followed with the deſired ſucceſs throughout all the provinces, except that of *Drontheim*, which roſe in rebellion againſt him, and attacked Chriſtianity with the ſame kind of arguments that OLAUS employed in eſtabliſhing it. This oppoſition occaſioned ſeveral bloody battles, which ended, however, in the defeat of the rebels, and of the god THOR, their tutelar deity, whoſe ſtatue OLAUS dragged from its place, and burnt publicly in the ſight of his worſhippers. This event dejected the courage of the inhabitants of *Drontheim*, who ſubmitted to the religion and laws of their conqueror. And thus before the reign of SUENON, at leaſt before the defeat of OLAUS by that prince, *Norway* was chriſtian. See *The Hiſtory of Denmark*, lately publiſhed in French by Mr. MALLET, Profeſſor in *Belles Lettres* at *Copenhagen*, vol. i. p. 52, 53.

various

various doctors, that were ſent to inſtruct this barbarous people, the moſt eminent, both in merit and authority, was GUTHEBALD, an Engliſh prieſt [w]. From *Norway*, Chriſtianity ſpread its ſalutary light through the adjacent countries, and was preached, with ſucceſs, in the *Orkney* iſlands, which were, at this time, ſubject to the Norwegian kings, and alſo in *Iceland* and *Old Groenland*; for it is evident, from many circumſtances and records of undoubted authority, that the greateſt part of the inhabitants of theſe countries had received the goſpel in this century [x].

IX. In *Germany* the pious exploits of OTHO the Great, contributed, in a ſignal manner, to promote the intereſt of Chriſtianity, and to fix and eſtabliſh it upon ſolid foundations throughout the empire. This truly great prince, whoſe pious magnanimity cloathed him with a luſtre infinitely ſuperior to that which he derived from his imperial dignity, was conſtantly employed in extirpating the remains of the ancient ſuperſtitions, and in ſupporting and confirming the infant church, which in ſeveral provinces had not yet arrived to any conſiderable degree of conſiſtence and vigour. That there might be rulers and paſtors to govern the church, and to contribute both by their doctrine and example to the reformation and improvement of an unpoliſhed and illiterate people, he eſtabliſhed biſhops in ſeveral places, and generouſly

The zeal of Otho the Great in the cauſe of Chriſtianity.

[w] *Chron. Danicum* à LUDEWIGIO *editum in Reliquiis MStorum*, tom. ix. p. 11. 16, 17.

[x] Concerning the converſion of the inhabitants of the *Orkneys*, ſee TORM. TORFÆI *Hiſtoria Rerum Orcadenſ.* lib. i. p. 22, and for an account of the Icelanders, the reader may conſult ARNGRIM. JONAS's *Cynogæa*, lib. i. and ARIUS *Multiſ. in Schedis Iſlandiæ*; as alſo TORFÆUS, his *Hiſtor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 378, 379. 417. and GABRIEL LIRON's *Singularités Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. i. p. 138.—The ſame TORFÆUS gives a full account of the introduction of Chriſtianity into *Groenland*, in his *Hiſtor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 374. and alſo in his *Groenlandia Antiqua*, c. xvii. p. 127.

CENT. X. PART I.

nerously erected and endowed the bishoprics of *Brandenburg*, *Havelberg*, *Meissen*, *Magdeburg*, and *Naumburg*; by which excellent establishments the church was furnished with eminent doctors from various parts, whose instructions were the occasion of raising up new labourers in the gospel harvest, and of thus multiplying the ministers of CHRIST from time to time. It was also through the munificence of the same prince, that many convents were erected for those who, in conformity with the false piety of the times, chose to finish their Christian course in the indolent sanctity of a solitary life, and it was by his express order that schools were established in almost every city for the education of the youth. All this may serve to shew us the generosity and zeal of this illustrious emperor, whose merit would have surpassed the highest encomiums, had his prudence and moderation been equal to the fervour of his piety, and the uprightness of his intentions. But the superstition of his empress [*y*], and the deplorable ignorance of the times deluded this good prince into the notion, that he obliged the Deity in proportion as he loaded the clergy with riches and honours, and that nothing was more proper to draw down upon him the divine protection, than the exercise of a boundless liberality to his ministers. In consequence of this idle and extravagant fancy, OTHO opened the sources of his opulence, which flowed into the church like an overgrown torrent, so that the bishops, monks, and religious houses wallowed in wealth and abundance. But succeeding ages perceived the unhappy effects of this excessive and ill-judged munificence; when the sacred orders employed this opulence, which they had acquired without either merit or labour,

[*y*] See the life of this empress, whose name was ADELAID, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of HENRY CANISIUS, tom. iii, part I. p. 69.

in

in gratifying their paſſions, in waging war againſt all who oppoſed their ambitious pretenſions, and in purchaſing the various pleaſures of a luxurious and effeminate life.*

The plan of a holy war formed in this century.

X. It was no doubtful mark of the progreſs and ſtrength of the Chriſtian cauſe that the European kings and princes began ſo early as this century to form the project of a holy war againſt the Mahometans, who were maſters of *Paleſtine*. They conſidered it as an intolerable reproach upon Chriſtians, that the very land in which the divine author of their religion had received his birth, exerciſed his miniſtry, and made expiation for the ſins of mortals, ſhould be abandoned to the enemies of the Chriſtian name. They alſo looked upon it as highly juſt, and ſuitable to the majeſty of the Chriſtian religion, to avenge the calamities and injuries, the perſecution and reproach, which its profeſſors had ſuffered under the Mahometan yoke. The bloody ſignal was accordingly given towards the concluſion of this century, by the Roman pontif SILVESTER II., and that in the firſt year of his pontificate. And this ſignal was an epiſtle, wrote in the name of the *church of Jeruſalem*, to the *church univerſal throughout the world* [z], in which the European powers are ſolemnly exhorted and entreated to ſuccour and deliver the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine*. The exhortations of the pontif were, however, without effect, except upon the inhabitants of *Piſa*, who are ſaid to have obeyed the papal ſummons with the utmoſt alacrity, and to have prepared themſelves immediately for a holy campaign [a].

[z] This is the xxviiith Epiſtle in the firſt part of the collection of the letters of SILVESTER II., that is publiſhed by DU CHESNE, in the third volume of his *Scriptor. Hiſtor. Franc.*

[a] See MURATORI *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iii. p. 400.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. X. PART I.

I. THE Chriſtian religion ſuffered leſs in this century from the cruelty of its enemies, than from the defection of its friends. Of all the Pagan monarchs, under whoſe government the Chriſtians lived, none behaved to them in a hoſtile manner, nor tormented them with the execution of compulſive edicts or penal laws, except GORMON and SWEIN, kings of *Denmark*. Notwithſtanding this, their affairs were far from being either in a fixed or flouriſhing ſtate; nay, their ſituation was full of uncertainty and peril, both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. The Saracens in *Aſia* and *Africa*, amidſt the inteſtine diviſions under which they groaned, and the calamities that overwhelmed them from different quarters, were extremely aſſiduous in propagating every where the doctrines of MAHOMET, nor were their efforts unſucceſsful. Multitudes of Chriſtians fell into their ſnares; and the Turks, a valiant and fierce nation, who inhabited the northern coaſt of the *Caſpian* ſea, received their doctrine. The uniformity of religion did not, however, produce a ſolid union of intereſt between the Turks and Saracens; on the contrary, their diſſenſions and quarrels were never more violent, than from the time that MAHOMET became their common chief in religious matters. The ſuccours of the former were implored by the Perſians, whoſe country was a prey to the ambitious uſurpations of the latter, and theſe ſuccours were granted with the utmoſt alacrity and readineſs. The Turks accordingly fell upon the Saracens in a furious

The progreſs of the Turks and Saracens.

furious manner, drove them out of the whole extent of the Perſian territories, and afterwards, with incredible rapidity and ſucceſs, invaded, ſeized, and plundered the other provinces that belonged to that people, whoſe deſolation, in reality, came on like a whirlwind. Thus the powerful empire of the Saracens, which its enemies had for ſo many years attempted in vain to overturn, fell at laſt by the hands of its allies and friends. The Turks accompliſhed what the Greeks and Romans ineffectually aimed at; they ſtruck ſuddenly that dreadful blow, which ruined at once the affairs of the Saracens in *Perſia*, and then deprived them, by degrees, of their other dominions; and thus the Ottoman empire, which was ſtill an object of terror to the Chriſtians, was eſtabliſhed upon the ruins of the Saracen dominion [*b*].

II. In the weſtern provinces, the Chriſtians had much to ſuffer from the hatred and cruelty of thoſe who remained under the darkneſs of paganiſm. The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in ſeveral parts of *France*, the moſt barbarous hoſtilities, and involved the Chriſtians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberleſs calamities. The Samaritans, Sclavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an averſion for the goſpel, or were ſunk in a ſtupid ignorance of its intrinſic excellence and its immortal bleſſings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Chriſtianity out of their own territories by the moſt barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infeſted the adjacent countries, where it was profeſſed, with fire and ſword, and left, wherever they went, the moſt

The weſtern Barbarians perſecute the Chriſtians.

[*b*] For a more ample account of theſe revolutions, ſee the *Annales Turcici* of LEUNCLAVIUS; as alſo GEORGII ELMACINI *Hiſtoria Saracenica*, p. 190. 203. 210.

CENT. X. PART I.

dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The Danes, moreover, did not ceaſe to moleſt the Chriſtians, until they were ſubdued by OTHO the Great, and thus, from being the enemies, became the friends of the Chriſtian cauſe. The Hungarians alſo contributed their part to the ſufferings of the church, by their incurſions into ſeveral parts of *Germany*, which they turned into ſcenes of deſolation and miſery; while the fierce Arabs, by their tyranny in *Spain*, and their depredations in *Italy* and the neighbouring iſlands, ſpread calamity and oppreſſion all around them, of which, no doubt, the Chriſtians eſtabliſhed in theſe parts had the heavieſt portion.

The effects of theſe calamities.

III. Whoever conſiders the endleſs vexations, perſecutions, and calamities, which the Chriſtians ſuffered from the nations that continued in their ancient ſuperſtitions, will eaſily perceive the reaſon of that fervent and inextinguiſhable zeal, which Chriſtian princes diſcovered for the converſion of theſe nations, whoſe impetuous and ſavage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of ſelf-preſervation, and a prudent regard to their own ſafety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the goſpel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adverſaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Chriſtianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of theſe nations, and ſoften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Chriſtian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw theſe infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpoſe, they propoſed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, offered them certain diſtricts and territories, auxiliary troops to maintain them againſt their enemies, upon condition that they would abandon

abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors, which was ſo proper to nouriſh their ferocity, and to encreaſe their paſſion for blood and carnage. Theſe offers were attended with the deſired ſucceſs, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themſelves to the inſtructions and exhortations of the Chriſtian miſſionaries, but alſo to oblige their ſubjects and armies to follow their examples in this reſpect.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

I. THE deplorable ignorance of this barbarous age, in which the drooping arts were totally neglected, and the ſciences ſeemed to be upon the point of expiring for want of encouragement, is unanimouſly confeſſed and lamented by all the writers who have tranſmitted to us any accounts of this period of time. Nor, indeed, will this fatal revolution, in the republic of letters, appear aſtoniſhing to ſuch as conſider, on the one hand, the terrible viciſſitudes, tumults, and wars that turned all things into confuſion both in the eaſtern and weſtern world, and, on the other, the ignominious ſtupidity and diſſoluteneſs of thoſe ſacred orders who had been appointed as the guardians of truth and learning. LEO, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, who aſcended the imperial throne of the Greeks towards the commencement of this century, was himſelf an eminent lover of learning, and an auſpicious and zealous protector of ſuch as diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the culture of the ſciences [*c*]. This noble and generous diſpoſition appeared with ſtill a greater luſtre in his ſon CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENETA, who not only

[*c*] See Jo. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. part II. cap. v. p. 363.

diſcovered

diſcovered the greateſt ardour for the revival of the arts and ſciences in *Greece* [*d*], but alſo employed the moſt effectual meaſures for the accompliſhment of this excellent purpoſe. It was with this view that he ſpared no expence in drawing to his court, and ſupporting in his dominions, a variety of learned men, each of whom excelled in ſome of the different branches of literature, and in cauſing the moſt diligent ſearch to be made after the writings of the ancients. With this view, alſo, he became himſelf an author [*e*], and thus animated by his example, as well as by his protection, men of genius and abilities to enrich the ſciences with their learned productions. He employed, moreover, a conſiderable number of able pens, in making valuable extracts from the commentaries and other compoſitions of the ancients; which extracts were preſerved in certain places for the benefit and ſatisfaction of the curious; and thus, by various exertions of liberality and zeal, this learned prince reſtored the arts and ſciences to a certain degree of life and vigour [*f*]. But few of the Greeks followed this great and illuſtrious example; nor was there any among the ſucceeding

[*d*] FABRICIUS, *Bibl. Græc.* lib. v. part II. cap. v. p. 486.

☞ [*e*] We have yet remaining of CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENETA, ſon of LEO the Philoſopher, the following productions:

The Life of the emperor Baſilius.

A Treatiſe upon the Art of Governing, in which he inveſtigates the origin of ſeveral nations, treats of their power, their progreſs, their revolutions, and their decline, and gives a ſeries of their princes and rulers.

A Diſcourſe concerning the manner of forming a Land Army and Naval Force in Order of Battle.

Two Books concerning the eaſtern and weſtern Provinces. Which may be conſidered as an account of the ſtate of the empire in the time of this prince.

[*f*] All this appears evident from the accounts left upon record by ZONARAS, in his *Annales*, tom. iii. p. 155. edit. *Pariſ.*

CENT. X. PART II.

emperors who equalled theſe two excellent princes in zeal for the advancement of learning, or in lending, by their protection and encouragement, an auſpicious hand to raiſe out of obſcurity and dejection, neglected and depreſſed genius. But what is ſtill more remarkable, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENETA, whom we have now been repreſenting as the reſtorer of letters, and whom the Greeks unanimouſly admire in this character, is ſuppoſed by ſome to have done conſiderable prejudice to the cauſe of learning by the very means he employed to promote its advancement. For by employing learned men to extract from the writers of antiquity what they thought might contribute to the improvement of the various arts and ſciences, he gave too much occaſion to neglect the ſources, and flattered the indolence of the effeminate Greeks, who confined their ſtudies to theſe extracts, and neglected, in effect, the peruſal of the writers from whom they were drawn. And hence it unfortunately happened, that many of the moſt celebrated authors of antiquity were loſt, at this time, through the ſloth and negligence of the Greeks.

Few eminent writers among the Greeks.

II. This method, as the event manifeſtly ſhewed, was really detrimental to the progreſs of true learning and genius. And accordingly we find among the Greek writers of this century but a ſmall number, who acquired a diſtinguiſhed and ſhining reputation in the republic of letters; ſo that the fair and engaging proſpects which ſeemed to ariſe to the cauſe of learning from the munificence and zeal of its imperial patrons, vaniſhed in a ſhort time; and though the ſeeds of ſcience were richly ſown, the natural expectations of an abundant harveſt were unhappily diſappointed. Nor did the cauſe of philoſophy ſucceed better than that of literature. Philoſophers indeed there were; and, among them, ſome that were not deſtitute

deſtitute of genius and abilities; but none who rendered their names immortal by productions that were worthy of being tranſmitted to poſterity: A certain number of rhetoricians and grammarians: A few poets who were above contempt; and ſeveral hiſtorians, who, without deſerving the higheſt encomiums, were not however totally void of merit: Such were the members which compoſed at this time the republic of letters in *Greece*, whoſe inhabitants ſeemed to take pleaſure in thoſe kinds of literature alone, in which induſtry, imagination, and memory are concerned.

The ſtate of learning among the Saracens.

III. *Egypt*, though at this time it groaned under a heavy and exaſperating yoke of oppreſſion and bondage, produced writers, who in genius and learning were no wiſe inferior to the moſt eminent of the Grecian literati. Of the many examples we might mention to prove the truth of this aſſertion, we ſhall confine ourſelves to that of EUTYCHIUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, who cultivated the ſciences of phyſic and theology with the greateſt ſucceſs, and caſt a new light upon them both by his excellent writings. The Arabians, during this whole century, preſerved that noble paſſion for the arts and ſciences, which had been kindled among them in the preceding age; and hence they abounded with phyſicians, mathematicians, and philoſophers, whoſe names and characters, together with an account of their reſpective abilities and talents, are given by LEO AFRICANUS and other literary hiſtorians.

In the weſtern provinces.

IV. The Latins preſent to us a ſpectacle of a very different kind. They were, almoſt without exception, ſunk in the moſt brutiſh and barbarous ignorance; ſo that, according to the unanimous accounts of the moſt credible writers, nothing could be more melancholy and deplorable than the darkneſs that reigned in the weſtern world during this century, which, with reſpect to learning

ing and philoſophy at leaſt, may be called the *Iron Age* of the Latins [*g*]. Some learned men of modern times have, we confeſs, ventured to call this in queſtion; but their doubts are certainly without foundation, and the matter of fact is too firmly eſtabliſhed by unqueſtionable authorities to loſe any part of its credit in conſequence of the objections they allege againſt it [*h*]. It is true, there were public ſchools founded in moſt of the European provinces, ſome of which were erected in the monaſteries, and the reſt in thoſe cities where the biſhops reſided. It is alſo true, that through this diſmal night of ignorance there ſhone forth from time to time, and more eſpecially towards the concluſion of this century, ſome genuiſes of a ſuperior order, who eyed with ardour the paths of ſcience, and caſt ſome rays of

[*g*] The teſtimonies that prove the ignorance which prevailed in the tenth century, are collected by DU BOULAY, in his *Hiſtoria Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 288; and alſo by LUD. ANT. MURATORI, in his *Antiquitat. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 831. et tom. ii. p. 141, &c.

[*h*] The famous LEIBNITZ, in his *Præfatio ad codicem juris Nat. et Gentium Diplomat.* affirms, that there was more knowledge and learning in the tenth century, than in the ſucceeding ages, particularly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But this is waſhing the Ethiopian; it is alſo an extravagant aſſertion, and ſavours much of paradox. We ſhall be better directed in our notions of this matter by MABILLON, in his *Præfatio ad Actor. S. S. Ordin. Bened. Quint. Sæc.* p. 2. by the authors of the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, and by LE BEUF's *Diſſertat. de Statu literarum in Francia, a Carolo M. ad regem Robert.* who all agree in acknowledging the groſs ignorance of this century, though they would engage us to believe that its barbariſm and darkneſs were not ſo hideous as they are commonly repreſented. There are, indeed, ſeveral conſiderations that render the reaſons and teſtimonies even of theſe writers not a little defective; but we nevertheleſs agree with them ſo far, as to grant that all learning and knowledge were not abſolutely extinguiſhed in Europe at this time, and that, in the records of this century, we ſhall find a few choſen ſpirits, who pierced through the cloud of ignorance that covered the multitude.

light

light upon the darkneſs of a barbarous age. But they were very few in number, and their extreme rarity is a ſufficient proof of the infelicity of the times in which they appeared. In the ſeminaries of learning, ſuch as they were, the ſeven liberal ſciences were taught in the moſt unſkilful and miſerable manner, and that by the monks, who eſteemed the arts and ſciences no farther than as they were ſubſervient to the intereſts of religion, or, to ſpeak more properly, to the views of ſuperſtition.

Monkiſh learning.

V. They who were the moſt learned and judicious among the monaſtic orders, and who were deſirous of employing uſefully a part of their leiſure, applied themſelves to the compoſition of annals and hiſtories, which ſavoured of the ignorance and barbariſm of the times. Such were ABO, LUITPRAND, WITTEKIND, FULCUIN, JOHANNES CAPUANUS, RATHERIUS, FLODOARD, NOTKER, ETHELBERT, and others, who, though very different from each other in their reſpective degrees of merit, were all in general ignorant of the true nature and rules of hiſtorical compoſition. Several of the poets of this age gave evident marks of true genius, but they were ſtrangers to the poetic art, which was not indeed neceſſary to ſatisfy a people utterly deſtitute of elegance and taſte. The grammarians and rhetoricians of theſe unhappy times are ſcarcely worthy of mention; their method of inſtructing was full of abſurdities, and their rules trivial and for the moſt part injudicious. The ſame judgment may be formed in general of the geometry, arithmetic, aſtronomy, and muſic, which were more or leſs taught in the public ſchools, and of which a more particular account would be uninſtructing and inſipid.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

VI. The philoſophy of the Latins extended no farther than the ſingle ſcience of *logic* and *dialectics*, which they looked upon as the ſum and ſubſtance of

CENT. X. PART II.

of all human wiſdom. But this logic, which was ſo highly admired, was drawn without the leaſt perſpicuity or method from a book of *Categories*, which ſome have unjuſtly attributed to AUGUSTIN, and others to PORPHYRY. It is true, indeed, that the *Timæus* of PLATO, the *Topica* of CICERO and ARISTOTLE, and the book of the latter, *De interpretatione*, with other compoſitions of the Greeks and Latins, were in the hands of ſeveral of the doctors of this century, as we learn from credible accounts; but the ſame accounts inform us, that the true ſenſe of theſe excellent authors was underſtood by almoſt none of thoſe that peruſed them daily [*i*]. It will appear, no doubt, ſurpriſing, that in ſuch an ignorant age ſuch a ſubtle queſtion as that concerning *univerſal ideas* ſhould ever have been thought of; true however it is, that the famous controverſy, *Whether univerſal ideas belonged to the claſs of objects, or of mere names*; a controverſy which perplexed and bewildered the Latin doctors in ſucceeding times, and gave riſe to the two oppoſite ſects of the *Nominaliſts* and *Realiſts*; was ſtarted for the firſt time in this century. Accordingly we find in ſeveral paſſages of the writers of this period, the ſeeds and beginnings of this tedious and intricate diſpute [*k*].

VII.

[*i*] GUNZO *Epiſtol. ad Monachos Augienſes in* MARTENE *Collect. Ampliſſ. Monumentor. Veter.* tom. iii. p. 304.

[*k*] This appears evident from the following remarkable paſſage, which the reader will find in the 304th page of the work cited in the preceding note, and in which the learned GUNZO expreſſes himſelf in the following manner: *Ariſtoteles, genus, ſpeciem, differentiam, proprium et accidens ſubſiſtere denegavit, quæ Platoni ſubſiſtentia perſuaſit. Ariſtoteli an Platoni magis credendum putatis? Magna eſt utriuſque auctoritas, quatenus vix audeat quis alterum alteri dignitate præferre.* Here we ſee plainly the ſeeds of diſcord ſown, and the foundation laid for that knotty diſpute which puzzled the metaphyſical brains of the Latin doctors in after-times. GONZO was not adventurous

VII. The drooping ſciences found an eminent and illuſtrious patron, towards the concluſion of this century, in the learned GERBERT, a native of *France*, who, upon his elevation to the pontificate, aſſumed the title of SYLVESTER II. The genius of this famous pontif was extenſive and ſublime, embracing all the different branches of literature; but its more peculiar bent was turned towards mathematical ſtudies. Mechanics, geometry, aſtronomy, arithmetic, and every other kind of knowledge that had the leaſt affinity to theſe important ſciences, were cultivated by this reſtorer of learning with the moſt ardent zeal, and not without ſucceſs, as his writings abundantly teſtify; nor did he ſtop here; but employed every method that was proper to encourage and animate others to the culture of the liberal arts and ſciences. The effects of this noble zeal were viſible in *Germany*, *France*, and *Italy*, both in this and in the following century; as by the writings, example, and encouraging exhortations of GERBERT, many were excited to the ſtudy of phyſic, mathematics, and philoſophy, and in general to the purſuit of ſcience in all its various branches. If, indeed, we compare this learned pontif with the mathematicians of modern times, his merit, in that point of view, will almoſt totally diſappear under ſuch a diſadvantageous compariſon; for his *geometry*, though it be eaſy and perſpicuous, is but elementary and ſuperficial [*l*]. Yet ſuch as it was, it was marvellous in an age of barbariſm and darkneſs, and ſurpaſſed the comprehenſion of thoſe pigmy philoſophers, whoſe eyes, under the auſpicious direction of GERBERT,

The reſtoration of letters in *Europe* by Sylveſter II.

turous enough to attempt a ſolution of this intricate queſtion, which he leaves undecided; others were leſs modeſt, without being more ſucceſsful.

[*l*] This geometry was publiſhed by PEZIUS, in his *Theſaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. iii. part II. p. 7.

were

CENT. X. PART II.

were but juſt beginning to open upon the light. Hence it was, that the geometrical figures, deſcribed by this mathematical pontif, were regarded by the monks as magical operations, and the pontif himſelf was treated as a magician and a diſciple of Satan [*m*].

Who derived his knowledge and erudition from the Arabians.

VIII. It was not, however, to the fecundity of his genius alone, that GERBERT was indebted for the knowledge with which he now began to enlighten the European provinces; he had derived a part of his erudition, particularly in phyſic, mathematics, and philoſophy, from the writings and inſtructions of the Arabians, who were ſettled in *Spain*. Thither he had repaired in purſuit of knowledge, and had ſpent ſome time in the ſeminaries of learning at *Cordoua* and *Seville*, with a view to hear the Arabian doctors [*n*]; and it was, perhaps, by his example, that the Europeans were directed and engaged to have recourſe to this ſource of inſtruction in after-times. For it is undeniably certain, that, from the time of GERBERT, ſuch of the Europeans as were ambitious of making any conſiderable progreſs in phyſic, arithmetic, geometry, or philoſophy, entertained the moſt eager and impatient deſire of receiving inſtruction either from the academical leſſons, or from the writings of the Arabian philoſophers, who had founded ſchools in ſeveral parts of *Spain* and *Italy*. Hence it was, that the moſt celebrated productions of theſe doctors were tranſlated into Latin, their tenets and ſyſtems adopted with zeal in the European ſchools, and that numbers went over to *Spain* and *Italy* to receive inſtruction from the mouths of theſe fa-

[*m*] See *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. vi. p. 558.—DU BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 314. 319.—NAUDE, *Apologie pour les Grands Hommes fauſſement accuſés de la Magie*, chap. xix. § 4.

[*n*] See DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 314.

mous

mous teachers, which were ſuppoſed to utter nothing but the deepeſt myſteries of wiſdom and knowledge. However exceſſive this veneration for the Arabian doctors may have been, it muſt be owned, nevertheleſs, that all the knowledge, whether of phyſic, aſtronomy, philoſophy, or mathematics, which flouriſhed in *Europe* from the tenth century, was originally derived from them; and that the Spaniſh Saracens, in a more particular manner, may be looked upon as the fathers of European philoſophy.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. TO thoſe who conſider the primitive dignity and the ſolemn nature of the miniſterial character, the corruptions of the clergy muſt appear deplorable beyond all expreſſion. Theſe corruptions were mounted to the moſt enormous height in that diſmal period of the church which we have now before us. Both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces, the clergy were, for the moſt part, compoſed of a moſt worthleſs ſet of men, ſhamefully illiterate and ſtupid, ignorant more eſpecially in religious matters, equally enſlaved to ſenſuality and ſuperſtition, and capable of the moſt abominable and flagitious deeds. This diſmal degeneracy of the ſacred order was, according to the moſt credible accounts, principally owing to the pretended chiefs and rulers of the univerſal church, who indulged themſelves in the commiſſion of the moſt odious crimes, and abandoned themſelves to the lawleſs impulſe of the moſt licentious paſſions without reluctance or remorſe, who confounded,

in ſhort, all difference between juſt and unjuſt, to ſatisfy their impious ambition, and whoſe ſpiritual empire was ſuch a diverſified ſcene of iniquity and violence, as never was exhibited under any of thoſe temporal tyrants, who have been the ſcourges of mankind. We may form ſome notion of the Grecian patriarchs from the ſingle example of THEOPHYLACT, who, according to the teſtimonies of the moſt reſpectable writers, made the moſt impious traffic of eccleſiaſtical promotions, and expreſſed no ſort of care about any thing but his dogs and horſes [*o*]. Degenerate, however, and licentious as theſe patriarchs might be, they were, generally ſpeaking, leſs profligate and indecent than the Roman pontifs.

The hiſtory of the Roman pontifs.

II. The hiſtory of the Roman pontifs, that lived in this century, is a hiſtory of ſo many monſters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible ſeries of the moſt flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even thoſe of the Romiſh communion, unanimouſly confeſs. The ſource of theſe diſorders muſt be ſought for principally in the calamities that fell upon the greateſt part of *Europe*, and that afflicted *Italy* in a particular manner, after the extinction of the race of CHARLEMAGNE. Upon the death of the pontif BENEDICT IV., which happened in the year 903, LEO V. was raiſed to the pontificate, which

☞ [*o*] This *exemplary* prelate, who ſold every eccleſiaſtical benefice as ſoon as it became vacant, had in his ſtable above 2000 hunting horſes, which he fed with pignuts, piſtachios, dates, dried grapes, figs ſteeped in the moſt exquiſite wines, to all which he aded the richeſt perfumes. One Holy Thurſday, as he was celebrating high-maſs, his groom brought him the joyful news that one of his favourite mares had foaled; upon which he threw down the Liturgy, left the church, and ran in raptures to the ſtable, where having expreſſed his joy at that *grand* event, he returned to the altar to finiſh the divine ſervice, which he had left interrupted during his abſence. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* livre lv. p. 97. edit. *Bruxelle.*

he

he enjoyed no longer than forty days, being dethroned by CHRISTOPHER, and caſt into priſon. CHRISTOPHER, in his turn, was deprived of the pontifical dignity the year following by SERGIUS III., a Roman preſbyter, ſeconded by the protection and influence of ADALBERT, a moſt powerful Tuſcan prince, who had a ſupreme and unlimited direction in all the affairs that were tranſacted at *Rome*. ANASTASIUS III. and LANDO, who, upon the death of SERGIUS, in the year 911, were raiſed ſucceſſively to the papal dignity, enjoyed it but for a ſhort time, and did nothing that could contribute to render their names illuſtrious.

John X. created Roman pontif.

III. After the death of LANDO, which happened in the year 914, ALBERIC [*p*], marquis or count of *Tuſcany*, whoſe opulence was prodigious, and whoſe authority in *Rome* was deſpotic and unlimited, obtained the pontificate for JOHN X., archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, in compliance with the ſolicitation of THEODORA, his mother-in-law, whoſe lewdneſs was the principle that intereſted her in this promotion [*q*]. This infamous election will not ſurpriſe ſuch as know that the laws of *Rome* were at this time abſolutely ſilent; that the dictates of juſtice and equity were overpowered and ſuſpended; and that all things were carried on in that great city by intereſt or cor-

☞ [*p*] It was ALBERT or ADALBERT, and not ALBERIC, who was the ſon-in-law of the elder THEODORA, of whom Dr. MOSHEIM here ſpeaks. ALBERIC was grandſon to this THEODORA, by her daughter MAROZIA, who was married to ALBERT. See SPANHEIM, *Eccl. Hiſt. Secul.* x. p. 1432. FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livre liv. p. 578. edit. *Bruxelle*. —— This latter hiſtorian is of opinion, that it was the younger THEODORA, the ſiſter of MAROZIA, who, from an amorous principle, raiſed JOHN X. to the pontificate.

☞ [*q*] THEODORA, miſtreſs of *Rome*, had JOHN X. raiſed to the pontificate, that ſhe might continue that licentious commerce in which ſhe had lived with that carnal eccleſiaſtic for many years paſt. See FLEURY, and other writers, &c.

ruption, by violence or fraud. JOHN X., though in other reſpects a ſcandalous example of iniquity and lewdneſs in the papal chair, acquired a certain degree of reputation by his glorious campaign againſt the Saracens, whom he drove from the ſettlements they had made upon the banks of the *Garigliano* [*r*]. He did not, however, enjoy his glory long; the enmity of MAROZIA, daughter of THEODORA, and wife of ALBERIC, proved fatal to him. For this bloody-minded woman having eſpouſed WIDO, or GUY, marquis of *Tuſcany*, after the death of her firſt conſort, engaged him to ſeize the wanton pontif, who was her mother's lover, and to put him to death in the priſon where he lay confined. This licentious and unlucky pontif was ſucceeded by LEO VI., who ſat but ſeven months in the apoſtolic chair, which was filled after him by STEPHEN VII. The death of this latter, which happened in the year 931, preſented to the ambition of MAROZIA an object worthy of its graſp; and accordingly ſhe raiſed to the papal dignity JOHN XI., who was the fruit of her lawleſs amours with one of the pretended ſucceſſors of St. PETER, SERGIUS III., whoſe adulterous commerce with that infamous woman gave an *infallible* guide to the Roman church [*s*].

☞ [*r*] In the original we have *Montem Garilianum*, which is, undoubtedly, a miſtake, as the *Garigliano* is a river in the kingdom of *Naples*, and not a mountain.

[*s*] The character and conduct of MAROZIA are acknowledged to have been moſt infamous by the unanimous teſtimony both of ancient and modern hiſtorians, who affirm, with one voice, that JOHN XI. was the fruit of her carnal commerce with SERGIUS III. ECCARD, alone, in his *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. ii. p. 131. has ventured to clear her from this reproach, and to aſſert, that SERGIUS, before his elevation to the pontificate, was her lawful and firſt huſband. The attempt, however, is highly extravagant, if not impudent, to pretend to acquit, without the leaſt teſtimony or proof of her innocence, a woman who is known to have been entirely deſtitute of every principle of virtue.

IV.

IV. JOHN XI., who was placed at the head of the church by the credit and influence of his mother, was pulled down from this ſummit of ſpiritual grandeur A. D. 933, by ALBERIC his half-brother, who had conceived the utmoſt averſion againſt him. His mother MAROZIA had, after the death of WIDO, entered anew into the bonds of matrimony with HUGO, king of *Italy*, who, having offended his ſtep-ſon ALBERIC, felt ſeverely the weight of his reſentment, which vented its fury upon the whole family; for ALBERIC drove out of *Rome* not only HUGO, but alſo MAROZIA and her ſon the pontif, and confined them in priſon, where the latter ended his days in the year 936. The four pontifs, who, in their turns, ſucceeded JOHN XI., and filled the papal chair until the year 956, were LEO VII., STEPHEN VIII., MARINUS II., and AGAPET, whoſe characters were much better than that of their predeceſſor, and whoſe government, at leaſt, was not attended with thoſe tumults and revolutions that had ſo often ſhook the pontifical throne, and baniſhed from *Rome* the ineſtimable bleſſings of peace and concord. Upon the death of AGAPET, which happened in the year 956, ALBERIC II., who to the dignity of Roman conſul joined a degree of authority and opulence which nothing could reſiſt, raiſed to the pontificate his ſon OCTAVIAN, who was yet in the early bloom of youth, and deſtitute, beſides, of every quality that was requiſite in order to diſcharge the duties of that high and important office. This unworthy pontif aſſumed the name of JOHN XII., and thus introduced the cuſtom, that has ſince been adopted by all his ſucceſſors in the ſee of *Rome*, of changing each their uſual name for another upon their acceſſion to the pontificate. John XI. and XII.

V. The fate of JOHN XII. was as unhappy as his promotion had been ſcandalous. Unable to bear the oppreſſive yoke of BERENGER II., king The fate of John XII.

CENT. X. PART II.

of *Italy*, he ſent ambaſſadors, in the year 960, to OTHO the Great, intreating him to march into *Italy* at the head of a powerful army, to deliver the church and the people from the tyranny under which they groaned. To theſe intreaties the perplexed pontif added a ſolemn promiſe, that, if the German monarch came to his aſſiſtance, he would array him with the purple and the other enſigns of ſovereignty, and proclaim him emperor of the Romans. OTHO received this embaſſy with pleaſure, marched into *Italy* at the head of a large body of troops, and was accordingly ſaluted by JOHN with the title of emperor of the Romans. The pontif, however, ſoon perceiving that he had acted with too much precipitation, repented of the ſtep he had taken, and, though he had ſworn allegiance to the emperor as his lawful ſovereign, and that in the moſt ſolemn manner, yet he broke his oath, and joined with ADALBERT, the ſon of BERENGER, againſt OTHO. This revolt was not left unpuniſhed. The emperor returned to *Rome* in the year 964; called a council, before which he accuſed and convicted the pontif of many crimes; and, after having degraded him, in the moſt ignominious manner, from his high office, he appointed LEO VIII. to fill his place. Upon OTHO's departure from *Rome*, JOHN returned to that city, and in a council, which he aſſembled in the year 964, condemned the pontif whom the emperor had elected, and ſoon after died in a miſerable and violent manner. After his death the Romans choſe BENEDICT V. biſhop of *Rome*, in oppoſition to LEO; but the emperor annulled this election, reſtored LEO to the papal chair, and carried BENEDICT to *Hamburgh*, where he died in exile [*t*].

VI.

[*t*] In the account I have here given of the pontifs of this century, I have conſulted the ſources, which are to be found, for the moſt part, in MURATORI's *Scriptores Rerum Italicar-*

as

CENT. X. PART II.

VI. The pontifs who governed the ſee of *Rome* from LEO VIII., who died A. D. 965, to GERBERT or SYLVESTER II., who was raiſed to the pontificate towards the concluſion of this century, were more happy in their adminiſtration, as well as more decent in their conduct, than their infamous predeceſſors; yet none of them ſo exemplary as to deſerve the applauſe that is due to eminent virtue. JOHN XIII., who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 965, by the authority of OTHO the Great, was driven out of *Rome* in the beginning of his adminiſtration; but, the year following, upon the emperor's return to *Italy*, he was reſtored to his high dignity, in the calm poſſeſſion of which he ended his days A. D. 972. His ſucceſſor BENEDICT VI. was not ſo happy; caſt into priſon by CRESCENTIUS, ſon of the famous THEORORA, in conſequence of the hatred which the Romans had conceived both againſt his perſon and government, he was loaded with all ſorts of ignominy, and was ſtrangled in the year 974, in the apartment where he lay confined. Unfortunately for him, OTHO the Great, whoſe power and ſeverity kept the Romans in awe, died in the year 973, and with him expired that order and diſcipline which he had reſtored in *Rome* by ſalutary laws executed with impartiality and vigour. The face of things was entirely

John XIII. Benedict VII.

as alſo BARONIUS, PETER DE MARCA, SIGONIUS *De Regno Italiæ*, with the learned annotations of ANT. SAXIUS, MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiæ*, PAGI, and other writers, all of whom have had acceſs to the ſources, and to ſeveral ancient manuſcripts, which have not as yet been publiſhed. The narrations I have here given, are moſt certainly true upon the whole. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that many parts of the papal hiſtory lie yet in great obſcurity, and ſtand much in need of farther illuſtration; nor will I deny that a ſpirit of partiality has been extremely detrimental to the hiſtory of the pontifs, by corrupting it, and rendering it uncertain in a multitude of places.

CENT. X. PART II.

changed by that event; licentiouſneſs and diſorder, ſeditions and aſſaſſinations reſumed their former ſway, and diffuſed their horrors through that miſerable city. After the death of BENEDICT, the papal chair was filled by FRANCO, who aſſumed the name of BONIFACE VII., but enjoyed his dignity only for a ſhort time; for ſcarcely a month had paſſed after his promotion, when he was depoſed from his office, expelled the city, and ſucceeded by DONUS II. [*u*], who is known by no other circumſtance than his name. Upon his death, which happened in the year 975, BENEDICT VII. was created pontif; and, during the ſpace of nine years, ruled the church without much oppoſition, and ended his days in peace. This peculiar happineſs was, without doubt, principally owing to the opulence and credit of the family to which he belonged; for he was nearly related to the famous ALBERIC, whoſe power, or rather deſpotiſm, had been unlimited in *Rome*.

John XIV. and XV.

VII. His ſucceſſor JOHN XIV., who, from the biſhopric of *Pavia* was raiſed to the pontificate, derived no ſupport from his birth, which was obſcure, nor did he continue to enjoy the protection of OTHO III., to whom he owed his promotion. Hence the calamities that fell upon him with ſuch fury, and the miſery that concluded his tranſitory grandeur; for BONIFACE VII., who had uſurped the papal throne in the year 974, and in a little time after had been baniſhed *Rome*, returned from *Conſtantinople*, whither he had fled for refuge, and ſeizing the unhappy pontif, had him thrown into priſon, and afterwards put to death. Thus BONIFACE reſumed the government of the church; but his reign was alſo tranſitory,

☞ [*u*] Some writers place DONUS II. before BENEDICT VI. See the *Tabulæ Synopticæ Hiſt. Eccleſ.* of the learned PFAFF,

for he died about ſix months after his reſtoration [w]. He was ſucceeded by JOHN XV., whom ſome writers call JOHN XVI., becauſe, as they allege, there was another JOHN, who ruled the church during the ſpace of four months, and whom they conſequently call JOHN XV. [x] Leaving it to the reader's choice to call that JOHN of whom we ſpeak, the XV. or the XVI. of that name, we ſhall only obſerve that he poſſeſſed the papal dignity from the year 985 to 996; that his adminiſtration was as happy as the troubled ſtate of the Roman affairs would permit; and that the tranquillity he enjoyed was not ſo much owing to his wiſdom and prudence, as to his being a Roman by birth, and to his deſcent from noble and illuſtrious anceſtors. Certain it is, at leaſt, that his ſucceſſor GREGORY V., who was a German, and who was elected pontif by the order of OTHO III., A. D. 996, met with a quite different treatment; for CRESCENS, the Roman conſul, drove him out of the city, and conferred his dignity upon JOHN XVI., formerly known by the name of PHILAGATHUS. This revolution was not, however, permanent in its effects, for OTHO III., alarmed by theſe diſturbances at *Rome*, marched into *Italy*, A. D. 998, at the head of a powerful army, and caſting into priſon the new pontif, whom the ſoldiers, in the firſt moment of their fury, had maimed and abuſed in a moſt barbarous manner, he reinſtated GREGORY in his former honours, and placed him anew at the head of the church. It was upon the death of this latter pon-

☞ [w] FLEURY ſays eleven months.

☞ [x] Among theſe writers is the learned PFAFF, in his *Tabulæ Synopticæ*, &c. But the Roman Catholic writers, whom Dr. MOSHEIM follows with good reaſon, do not count among the number of the pontifs that JOHN who governed the church of *Rome* during the ſpace of four months after the death of BONIFACE VII., becauſe he was never duly inveſted, by conſecration, with the papal dignity.

tif, which happened ſoon after his reſtoration; that the ſame emperor raiſed to the papal dignity his preceptor and friend, the famous and learned GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II., whoſe promotion was attended with the univerſal approbation of the Roman people [*y*].

The influence and authority of the pontifs increaſe daily.

VIII. Amidſt theſe frequent commotions, and even amidſt the repeated enormities and flagitious crimes of thoſe who gave themſelves out for CHRIST's vice-gerents upon earth, the power and authority of the Roman pontifs increaſed imperceptibly from day to day; ſuch were the effects of that ignorance and ſuperſtition that reigned without controul in theſe miſerable times. OTHO the Great had indeed publiſhed a ſolemn edict, prohibiting the election of any pontif without the previous knowledge and conſent of the emperor; which edict, as all writers unanimouſly agree, remained in force from the time of its publication to the concluſion of this century. It is alſo to be obſerved, that the ſame emperor, as likewiſe his ſon and grandſon, who ſucceeded him in the empire, maintained, without interruption, their right of ſupremacy over the city of *Rome*, its territory, and its pontif, as may be demonſtrably proved from a multitude of examples. It is, moreover, equally certain, that the German, French, and Italian biſhops, who were not ignorant of the nature of their privileges, and the extent of their juriſdiction, were, during this whole century, perpetually upon their guard againſt every attempt the Roman pontif might make to

[*y*] The hiſtory of the Roman pontifs of this period is not only extremely barren of intereſting events, but alſo obſcure, and uncertain in many reſpects. In the accounts I have here given of them, I have followed principally LUD. ANT. MURATORI's *Annales Italiæ*, and the *Conatus Chronologico-Hiſtoricus de Romanis Pontificibus*, which the learned PAPEBROCHIUS has prefixed to his *Acta Sanctorum, Menſis Maii*.

aſſume to himſelf *alone* a legiſlative authority in the church. But, notwithſtanding all this, the biſhops of *Rome* found means of augmenting their influence, and, partly by open violence, partly by ſecret and fraudulent ſtratagems, encroached not only upon the privileges of the biſhops, but alſo upon the juriſdiction and rights of kings and emperors [z]. Their ambitious attempts were ſeconded and juſtified by the ſcandalous adulation of certain mercenary prelates, who exalted the dignity and prerogatives of, what they called, the apoſtolic ſee, in the moſt pompous and extravagant terms. Several learned writers have obſerved, that in this century certain biſhops maintained publicly that the Roman pontifs were not only biſhops of *Rome*, but of the whole world, an aſſertion which hitherto none had ventured to make [a]; and that even among the French clergy, it had been affirmed by ſome, that *the authority of the Biſhops, though divine in its origin, was conveyed to them by St.* PETER, *the prince of the apoſtles* [b].

IX. The adventurous ambition of the biſhops of *Rome*, who left no means unemployed to extend their juriſdiction, exhibited an example which the inferior prelates followed with the moſt zealous and indefatigable emulation. Several biſhops and abbots had begun, even from the time that the deſcendants of CHARLEMAGNE ſat on the imperial throne, to enlarge their prerogatives, and had actually obtained, for their tenants and their poſſeſſions, an immunity from the juriſdiction of the counts and other magiſtrates, as alſo from taxes and impoſts of all kinds. But in this century they carried their pretenſions ſtill

The biſhops and abbots enlarge alſo their juriſdiction and prerogatives.

[z] Several examples of theſe uſurpations may be found in the *Hiſtoire du droit Eccleſ. François*, tom. i. p. 217. edit. in 8vo.

[a] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 98.

[b] Ibid. p. 186.

farther;

CENT. X. PART II.

farther; aimed at the civil juriſdiction over the cities and territories in which they exerciſed a ſpiritual dominion, and aſpired after nothing leſs than the honours and authority of dukes, marquiſes, and counts of the empire. Among the principal circumſtances that animated their zeal in the purſuit of theſe dignities, we may reckon the perpetual and bitter conteſts concerning juriſdiction and other matters, that reigned between the dukes and counts, who were governors of cities, and the biſhops and abbots, who were their ghoſtly rulers. The latter, therefore, ſeizing the favourable opportunity that was offered them by the ſuperſtition of the times, uſed every method that might be effectual to obtain that high rank, that hitherto ſtood in the way of their ambition. And the emperors and kings to whom they addreſſed their preſumptuous requeſts, generally granted them, either from a deſire of pacifying the contentions and quarrels that aroſe between civil and military magiſtrates, or from a devout reverence for the ſacred order, or with a view to augment their own authority, and to confirm their dominion by the good ſervices of the biſhops, whoſe influence was very great upon the minds of the people. Such were the different motives that engaged princes to enlarge the authority and juriſdiction of the clergy; and hence we ſee from this century downwards ſo many biſhops and abbots inveſted with characters, employments, and titles ſo foreign to their ſpiritual offices and functions, and clothed with the honours of dukes, marquiſes, counts, and viſcounts [c].

X.

[c] The learned LOUIS THOMASSIN, in his book *De Diſciplina Eccleſiæ veteri et nova*, tom. iii. lib. i. cap. xxviii. p. 89. has collected a multitude of examples to prove that the titles and prerogatives of dukes and counts were conferred upon

X. Besides the reproach of the grossest ignorance, which the Latin clergy in this century so justly deserve [*d*], they were also chargeable, in a very heinous degree, with two other odious and enormous vices, even *concubinage* and *simony*, which the greatest part of the writers of these unhappy times acknowledge and deplore. As to the first of these vices, it was practised too openly to admit of any doubt. The priests, and what is still more surprising, even the sanctimonious monks, fell victims to the triumphant charms of the sex, and to the imperious dominion of their carnal lusts; and, entering into the bonds of wedlock or concubinage, squandered away in a most luxurious manner, with their wives and mistresses, the revenues of the church [*e*]. The other vice above mentioned reigned with an equal degree of impudence and licentiousness. The election of bishops and abbots was no longer made according to the laws of the church; but kings and princes, or

Simony and *concubinage* the principal vices of the clergy.

upon certain prelates so early as the ninth century; nay, some bishops trace even to the eighth century the rise and first beginnings of that princely dominion which they now enjoy. But notwithstanding all this, if I be not entirely and grossly mistaken, there cannot be produced any evident and indisputable example of this princely dominion, previous to the tenth century.

[*d*] RATHERIUS, speaking of the clergy of *Verona*, in his *Itinerarium*, which is published in the *Spicilegium* of DACHERIUS, tom. i. p. 381. says, that he found many among them who could not even repeat the Apostles Creed. His words are, *Scisciatus de fide illorum, inveni plurimos neque ipsum sapere Symbolum, qui fuisse creditur Apostolorum.*

[*e*] That this custom was introduced towards the commencement of this century is manifest, from the testimony of ORDERICUS VITALIS and other writers, and also from a letter of MANTIO, bishop of *Chalons* in *Champagne*, which is published by MABILLON, in his *Analecta veterum*, p. 429. edit. nov. As to the charge brought against the Italian monks of their spending the treasures of the church upon their wives or mistresses, see HUGO, *De Monasterii Farfensis destructione*, which is published in MURATORI's *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 278,

their

CENT. X. PART II.

their miniſters and favourites, either conferred theſe eccleſiaſtical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or ſold them, without ſhame, to the higheſt bidder [*f*]. Hence it happened, that the moſt ſtupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the moſt important ſtations in the church; and that, upon ſeveral occaſions, even ſoldiers, civil magiſtrates, counts, and ſuch like perſons, were, by a ſtrange metamorphoſis, converted into biſhops and abbots. GREGORY VII. endeavoured, in the following century, to put a ſtop to theſe two growing evils.

The monkiſh diſcipline declines to nothing.

XI. While the monaſtic orders, among the Greeks and Orientals, maintained ſtill an external appearance of religion and decency, the Latin monks, towards the commencement of this century, had ſo entirely loſt ſight of all ſubordination and diſcipline, that the greateſt part of them knew not even by name the rule of St. BENEDICT, which they were obliged to obſerve. A noble Frank, whoſe name was ODO, a man as learned and pious as the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the times would permit, endeavoured to remedy this diſorder; nor were his attempts totally unſucceſsful. This zealous eccleſiaſtic being created, in the year 927, abbot of *Clugni*, in the province of *Burgundy*, upon the death of BERNO, not only obliged the monks to live in a rigorous obſervance of their rules, but alſo added to their diſcipline a new ſet of rites and ceremonies, which, notwithſtanding the air of ſanctity that attended them, were, in reality, inſignificant and trifling, and yet at the ſame time

[*f*] Many infamous and ſtriking examples and proofs of ſimoniacal practice may be found in the work entitled *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 23. 37. tom. ii. p. 173. 179. Add to this ABBONIS *Apologeticum*, which is publiſhed at the end of the *Codex Canon. Pithoei*, p. 398. as alſo MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v.

ſevere

ſevere and burthenſome [*g*]. This new rule of diſcipline covered its author with glory, and, in a ſhort time, was adopted in all the European convents; for the greateſt part of the ancient monaſteries, which had been founded in *France*, *Germany*, *Italy*, *Britain*, and *Spain*, received the rule of the monks of *Clugni*, to which alſo the convents, newly eſtabliſhed, were ſubjected by their founders. And thus it was, that the *Order of Clugni* arrived to that high degree of eminence and authority, opulence and dignity, which it exhibited to the Chriſtian world in the following century [*h*].

XII. The

[*g*] See MABILLON *Annal. Benedict.* tom. iii. p. 386. and *Præf. ad Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* v. p. 26. See alſo the *Acta Sanctor. Bened. Sæc.* v. p. 66. in which he ſpeaks largely concerning BERNO, the firſt abbot of *Clugni*, who laid the foundations of that order, and of ODO (p. 122) who gave it a new degree of perfection. The learned HELYOT, in his *Hiſtoire des Ordres Religieuſes*, tom. v. p. 184. has given a complete and elegant hiſtory of the order of *Clugni*, and the preſent ſtate of that famous monaſtery is deſcribed by MARTENE, in his *Voyage Litter. de deux Benedict.* part I. p. 227.

[*h*] If we are not miſtaken, the greateſt part of eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians have not perceived the true meaning and force of the word *order* in its application to the *Ciſtertian* monks, thoſe of *Clugni*, and other convents. They imagine that this term ſignifies a new monaſtic inſtitution, as if the *Order of Clugni* was a new ſect of monks never before heard of. But this is a great error, into which they fall by confounding the ancient meaning of that term with the ſenſe in which it is uſed in modern times. The word *order*, when employed by the writers of the tenth century, ſignified no more at firſt than a certain form or rule of monaſtic diſcipline; but from this primitive ſignification, another, and a ſecondary one, was gradually derived. So that by the word *order* is alſo underſtood, an aſſociation or confederacy of ſeveral monaſteries, ſubjected to the ſame rule of diſcipline under the juriſdiction and inſpection of one common chief. Hence we conclude, that the *Order of Clugni* was not a new ſect of monks, ſuch as were the *Carthuſian*, *Dominican*, and *Franciſcan Orders*; but ſignified only *firſt*, that new inſtitution, or rule of diſcipline, which ODO had preſcribed to the Benedictine monks, who were ſettled at *Clugni*,

CENT. X. PART II.

Greek writers.

XII. The more eminent Greek writers of this century are eaſily numbered; among them was SIMEON, high treaſurer of *Conſtantinople*, who, from his giving a new and more elegant ſtyle to the *Lives of the Saints*, which had been originally compoſed in a groſs and barbarous language, was diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Metaphraſt*, or *Tranſlator* [*i*]. He did not, however, content himſelf with digeſting, poliſhing, and embelliſhing the ſaintly chronicle; but went ſo far as to augment it with a multitude of trifling fables drawn from the fecundity of his own imagination.

NICON, an Armenian monk, compoſed a treatiſe *Concerning the Religion of the Armenians*, which is not altogether contemptible.

Some place in this century OLYMPIODORUS and OECUMENIUS [*k*], who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by thoſe compilations which were known by the name of *Catenæ*, or *Chains*, and of which we have had occaſion to ſpeak more than once in the courſe of this hiſtory. But it is by no means certain, that theſe two writers belong to the tenth century, and they are placed there only by conjecture.

It is much more probable, that the learned SUIDAS, author of the celebrated *Greek Lexicon*, lived in the period now before us.

Among the Arabians, no author acquired a higher reputation than EUTYCHIUS, biſhop of

Clugni, and, *afterwards*, that prodigious multitude of monaſteries throughout *Europe*, which received the rule eſtabliſhed at *Clugni*, and were formed by aſſociation into a ſort of community, of which the abbot *Clugni* was the chief.

[*i*] See LEO ALLATIUS, *De Symeonum Scriptis*, p. 24.—Jo. BOLLANDUS, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Antwerp*, § iii. p. 6.

[*k*] For an account of OECUMENIUS, See MONTFAUCON, *Biblioth. Corſliniana*, p. 274.

Alexandria,

Alexandria, whoſe *Annals*, with ſeveral other productions of his learned pen, are ſtill extant [*l*].

Latin writers.

XIII. The moſt eminent of the Latin writers of this century was GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II., who has already been mentioned with the applauſe due to his ſingular merit. The other writers of this age were far from being eminent in any reſpect.

ODO, who laid the foundations of the celebrated *Order of Clugni*, left behind him ſeveral productions in which the groſſeſt ſuperſtition reigns, and in which it is difficult to perceive the ſmalleſt marks of true genius or ſolid judgment [*m*].

The learned reader will form a different opinion of RATHEIR, biſhop of *Verona*, whoſe works, yet extant, give evident proofs of ſagacity and judgment, and breathe throughout an ardent love of virtue [*n*].

ATTO, biſhop of *Vercelli*, compoſed a treatiſe, *De preſſuris Eccleſiaſticis*, i. e. *Concerning the Sufferings and Grievances of the Church*, which ſhews in their true colours the ſpirit and complexion of the times [*o*].

DUNSTAN, the famous abbot of *Glaſſenbury*, and afterwards archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, compoſed in favour of the monks a book, *De Concordia Regularum*, i. e. *Concerning the Harmony of the Monaſtic Rules* [*p*].

ELFRIC, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, acquired a conſiderable reputation, among the Anglo-Sax-

[*l*] See JO. ALBERT. FABRICII *Bibliographia Antiquaria*, p. 179.—As alſo EUSEBII RENAUDOTI *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 347.

[*m*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 229.

[*n*] Id. ibid. p. 339.

[*o*] Id. ibid. p. 281.

☞ [*p*] See the ample account that is given of this eminent prelate in COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 181. 183, 184, 185. 197. 203.

ons

CENT. X. PART II.

ons eſtabliſhed in *Britain*, by various productions [*q*].

BURCHARD, biſhop of *Worms*, is higly eſteemed among the Canoniſts on account of his celebrated *Decreta*, which he has divided into XX books; though a part of the merit of this collection of *Canons* is due to OLBERT, with whoſe aſſiſtance it was compoſed [*r*].

ODILO, archbiſhop of *Lyons* [*s*], was the author of ſome inſipid diſcourſes, and other productions, whoſe mediocrity has almoſt ſunk them in a total oblivion.

As to the hiſtorical writers and annaliſts who lived in this century, their works and abilities have been already conſidered in their proper place.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church during this century.

The ſtate of religion.

I. THE ſtate of religion in this century was ſuch as might be expected in times of prevailing ignorance and corruption. The moſt important doctrines of Chriſtianity were disfigured and perverted in the moſt wretched manner, and

☞ [*q*] We have a *Grammar* and a *Dictionary* compoſed by this learned prelate; as alſo an Anglo-Saxon tranſlation of the *Firſt Books of the Holy Scripture*, *A Hiſtory of the Church*, and 180 *Sermons*. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccl.* livre lviii. p. 384. edit. *de Bruxelles*.

[*r*] See the *Chronicon Wormatienſe in* LUDWIG's *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptorum*, tom. ii. p. 43—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 295.

☞ [*s*] ODILO was abbot of *Clugni*, and not archbiſhop of *Lyons*, which latter eminent ſtation he obſtinately refuſed, notwithſtanding the urgent entreaties employed both by pontiffs and emperors to engage him to accept it. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccl.* livre lix. p. 520. edit. *de Bruxelles*.

ſuch

ſuch as had preſerved, in unſkilful hands, their primitive purity, were nevertheleſs obſcured with a multitude of vain opinions and idle fancies, ſo that their intrinſic excellence and luſtre were little attended to; all this will appear evident to thoſe who look with the ſmalleſt degree of attention into the writers of this age. Both Greeks and Latins placed the eſſence and life of religion in the worſhip of images and departed ſaints, in ſearching after with zeal, and preſerving with a devout care and veneration, the ſacred relics of holy men and women, and in accumulating riches upon the prieſts and monks, whoſe opulence increaſed with the progreſs of ſuperſtition. Scarcely did any Chriſtian dare to approach the throne of God, without rendering firſt the ſaints and images propitious by a ſolemn round of expiatory rites and luſtrations. The ardour alſo with which relics were ſought, ſurpaſſes almoſt all credibility; it had ſeized all ranks and orders among the people, and was grown into a ſort of fanaticiſm and frenzy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the Supreme Being interpoſed, in an eſpecial and extraordinary manner, to diſcover to doating old wives and bare-headed friars the places where the bones or carcaſes of the ſaints lay diſperſed or interred. The fears of purgatory, of that fire that was to deſtroy the remaining impurities of departed ſouls, were now carried to the greateſt height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehenſions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter eaſily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the ſaints; while from the pains of purgatory they knew there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding theſe ſuperſtitious terrors admirably adapted to increaſe their authority and to promote their intereſt, uſed every method to augment them, and by the moſt pathetic

CENT. X. PART II.

diſcourſes, accompanied with monſtrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to eſtabliſh the doctrine of purgatory, and alſo to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.

The diſputes concerning predeſtination and the Lord's ſupper.

II. The conteſts concerning predeſtination and grace, as alſo concerning the euchariſt, that had agitated the church in the preceding century, were in this happily reduced to ſilence. This was owing to the mutual toleration that was practiſed by the contending parties, who, as we learn from writers of undoubted credit, left it to each other's free choice to retain, or to change, their former opinions. Beſides, the ignorance and ſtupidity of this degenerate age were ill-ſuited to ſuch deep inquiries as theſe conteſts demanded; nor was there almoſt any curioſity among an illiterate multitude to know the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning theſe and other knotty points of theology. Thus it happened, that the followers of AUGUSTIN and PELAGIUS flouriſhed equally in this century; and that if there were many who maintained the corporal preſence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the holy ſacrament, there were ſtill more who either came to no fixed determination upon this point, or declared it publicly as their opinion, that the divine Saviour was really abſent from the euchariſtical ſacrament, and was received only by a certain inward impulſe of faith, and that in a manner wholly ſpiritual [*t*]. This

[*t*] It is certain, that the Latin doctors of this century differed much in their ſentiments about the manner in which the body and blood of CHRIST were preſent in the euchariſt; this is granted by ſuch of the Roman catholic writers as have been ingenuous enough to ſacrifice the ſpirit of party to the love of truth. That the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it is commonly called, was unknown to the Engliſh in this century, has been abundantly proved from the public *Homilies* by RAPIN DE THOYRAS, in his *Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. p. 463. It is,

This mutual toleration, as it is eaſy to conclude from what has been already obſerved, muſt not be attributed either to the wiſdom or virtue of an age, which was almoſt totally deſtitute of both. The truth of the matter is, that the divines of this century wanted both the capacity and the inclination to attack or defend any doctrine, whoſe refutation or defence required the ſmalleſt portion of learning or logic.

Superſtition nouriſhed by a multitude of vain and idle opinions.

III. That the whole Chriſtian world was covered, at this time, with a thick and gloomy veil of ſuperſtition, is evident from a prodigious number of teſtimonies and examples, which it is needleſs to mention. This horrible cloud, which hid almoſt every ray of truth from the eyes of the multitude, furniſhed a favourable opportunity to the prieſts and monks of propagating many abſurd and ridiculous opinions, which contributed not a little to confirm their credit. Among theſe opinions, which diſhonoured ſo frequently the Latin church, and produced from time to time ſuch violent agitations, none occaſioned ſuch a univerſal panic, nor ſuch dreadful impreſſions of terror or diſmay, as a notion that now prevailed of the immediate approach of the day of judgment. This notion, which took its riſe from a remarkable paſſage in the *Revelations of St.* JOHN [*u*], and had been

is, however, to be confeſſed, on the other hand, that this abſurd doctrine was already adopted by ſeveral French and German divines. ☞ For a judicious account of the opinions of the Saxon-Engliſh church concerning the euchariſt, ſee COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 204. 266.

☞ [*u*] The paſſage here referred to, is in the twentieth chapter of the *Book of Revelations*, at the 2d, 3d, and 4th verſes; "And he laid hold of the dragon, that old ſerpent, "which is the devil and ſatan, and bound him a *thouſand* "*years*;—and caſt him into the bottomleſs pit, and ſhut him "up, and ſet a ſeal upon him, that he ſhould deceive the na- "tions no more till the thouſand years ſhould be fulfilled; "and

CENT. X. PART II.

been entertained by ſome doctors in the preceding century, was advanced publicly by many at this time, and ſpreading itſelf with an amazing rapidity through the European provinces, it threw them into the deepeſt conſternation and anguiſh. For they imagined that St. JOHN had clearly foretold that after a thouſand years from the birth of CHRIST, SATAN was to be let looſe from his priſon, ANTICHRIST to come, and the deſtruction and conflagration of the world to follow theſe great and terrible events. Hence prodigious numbers of people abandoned all their civil connexions and their parental relations, and giving over to the churches or monaſteries all their lands, treaſures, and worldly effects, repaired with the utmoſt precipitation to *Paleſtine*, where they imagined that CHRIST would deſcend from heaven to judge the world. Others devoted themſelves by a ſolemn and voluntary oath to the ſervice of the churches, convents, and prieſthood, whoſe ſlaves they became, in the moſt rigorous ſenſe of that word, performing daily their heavy taſks; and all this from a notion that the Supreme Judge would diminiſh the ſeverity of their ſentence, and look upon them with a more favourable and propitious eye, on account of their having made themſelves the ſlaves of his miniſters. When an eclipſe of the ſun or moon happened to be viſible, the cities were deſerted, and their miſerable inhabitants fled for refuge to hollow caverns, and hid themſelves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending ſummits of ſteep mountains. The opulent at-

" and after that he muſt be looſed a little ſeaſon.—And I " ſaw thrones, and they ſat upon them, and judgment was " given unto them: and I ſaw the ſouls of them that were " beheaded for the witneſs of Jeſus, and for the word of " God, and which had not worſhipped the beaſt, neither " his image, neither had received his mark upon their fore- " heads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with " Chriſt a thouſand years."

tempted

tempted to bribe the Deity and the ſaintly tribe by rich donations conferred upon the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders, who were looked upon as the immediate vicegerents of heaven. In many places, temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were ſuffered to decay, nay, were deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any uſe ſince the final diſſolution of all things was at hand. In a word, no language is ſufficient to expreſs the confuſion and deſpair that tormented the minds of miſerable mortals upon this occaſion. This general deluſion was, indeed, oppoſed and combated by the diſcerning few, who endeavoured to diſpel theſe groundleſs terrors, and to efface the notion from which they aroſe, in the minds of the people. But their attempts were ineffectual; nor could the dreadful apprehenſions of the ſuperſtitious multitude be entirely removed before the concluſion of this century. Then, when they ſaw that the ſo much dreaded period had paſſed without the arrival of any great calamity, they began to underſtand that St. JOHN had not really foretold what they ſo much feared [*w*].

IV.

[*w*] Almoſt all the donations that were made to the church during this century, carry evident marks of this groundleſs panic that had ſeized all the European nations, as the reaſons of theſe donations are generally expreſſed in the following words: *Appropinquante mundi termino*, &c. i. e. *The end of the world being now at hand*, &c. Among the many undeniable teſtimonies that we have from ancient records of this univerſal deluſion, that was ſo profitable to the ſacerdotal order, we ſhall confine ourſelves to the quotation of one very remarkable paſſage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, abbot of *Fleury*, *adverſus Arnulphum*, i. e. ARNOUL biſhop of *Orleans*, which apology is publiſhed by the learned FRANCIS PITHOU, in the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Romanæ*, p. 401. The words of ABBO are as follow: *De fine quoque mundi coram populo ſermonem in Eccleſia Pariſiorum Adoleſcentulus audivi, quod ſtatim finito mille annorum numero Antichriſtus adveniret, et non longo poſt tempore univerſale judicium ſuccederet: cui prædicationi ex Evangeliis, ac Apocalypſi,*

CENT. X. PART II.

The ſaints multiplied.

IV. The number of the ſaints, who were looked upon as miniſters of the kingdom of heaven, and whoſe patronage was eſteemed ſuch an unſpeakable bleſſing, was now multiplied every where, and the celeſtial courts were filled with new legions of this ſpecies of beings, ſome of which, as we have had formerly occaſion to obſerve, had no exiſtence but in the imagination of their deluded clients and worſhippers. This multiplication of ſaints may be eaſily accounted for, when we conſider that ſuperſtition, the ſource of fear, was grown to ſuch an enormous height in this age, as rendered the creation of new patrons neceſſary to calm the anxiety of trembling mortals. Beſides, the corruption and impiety that now reigned with a horrid ſway, and the licentiouſneſs and diſſolution that had ſo generally infected all ranks and orders of men, rendered the reputation of ſanctity very eaſy to be acquired; for, amidſt ſuch a perverſe generation, it demanded no great efforts of virtue to be eſteemed holy, and this, no doubt, contributed to increaſe conſiderably the number of the celeſtial advocates. All thoſe, to whom nature had given an auſtere complexion, a gloomy temper, or an enthuſiaſtic imagination, were, in conſequence of an advantageous compariſon with the profligate multitude, revered as the favourites of heaven, and as the friends of God.

The Roman pontif, who before this period had pretended to the right of creating ſaints by his ſole authority, gave, in this century, the firſt ſpecimen of this ghoſtly power; for in the preceding ages there is no example of his having exerciſed

calypſis et libro Danielis quæ potui virtute reſtiti. Denique et errorem, qui de fine mundi inolevit, Abbas meus beatæ memoriæ Richardus, ſagaci animo propulit, poſtquam literas à Lotharienſibus accepit, quibus me reſpondere juſſit. Nam fama pæne totum mundum impleverat, quod, quando Annunciatio Dominica in Paraſceve contigiſſet, abſque ullo ſcrupulo finis ſæculi eſſet.

this

this privilege alone. This ſpecimen was given in the year 993, by JOHN XV., who, with all the formalities of a ſolemn canonization, enrolled UDALRIC, biſhop of *Augſburgh*, in the number of the ſaints, and thus conferred upon him a title to the worſhip and veneration of Chriſtians [x]. We muſt not, however, conclude from hence, that after this period the privilege of canonizing new ſaints was veſted ſolely in the Roman pontifs [y]; for there are ſeveral examples upon record, which prove, that not only provincial councils, but alſo ſeveral of the firſt order among the biſhops, advanced to the rank of ſaints ſuch as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celeſtial patrons of the church, without ever conſulting the Roman pontif, until the twelfth century [z]. Then ALEXANDER III. abrogated this privilege of the biſhops and councils, and placed *canonization* in the number of the more important acts of authority [a], which the ſovereign pontif alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exerciſe.

The merit of the commentators of this century conſidered.

V. The expoſitors and commentators, who attempted in this century to illuſtrate and explain the ſacred writings, were too mean in their abilities, and too unſucceſsful in their undertakings, to deſerve almoſt any notice; for it is extremely uncertain, whether or no the works of OLYMPIODORUS and OECUMENIUS are to be conſidered as the productions of this age. Among the Latins

[x] FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 259.

[y] This abſurd opinion has been maintained with warmth by PHIL. BONNANUS, in his *Numiſmata Pontif. Romanorum*, tom. i. p. 41.

[z] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 260. tom. iii. p. 30.—ARM. DE LA CHAPELLE, *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, tom. x. p. 105.—MABILLON, *Præfat. ad Sæc. v. Benedict.* p. 53.

[a] Theſe were called the *Cauſæ Majores*.

CENT. X. PART II.

REMI, or REMIGIUS, biſhop of *Auxerre*, continued the expoſition of the holy ſcriptures, which he had begun in the preceding century; but his work is highly defective in various reſpects; for he takes very little pains in explaining the literal ſenſe of the words, and employs the whole force of his fantaſtic genius in unfolding their pretended myſtical ſignification, which he looked upon as infinitely more intereſting than their plain and literal meaning. Beſides, his explications are rarely the fruit of his own genius and invention, but are, generally ſpeaking, mere compilations from ancient commentators. As to the *Moral obſervations of* ODO *upon the book of Job* [*b*], they are tranſcribed from a work of GREGORY the Great, which bears the ſame title. We mention no more; if, however, any are deſirous of an ample account of thoſe who were eſteemed the principal commentators in this century, they will find it in a book wrote profeſſedly upon this ſubject by NOTKERUS BALBULUS.

The ſtate of theology and morals in this century.

VI. The ſcience of theology was abſolutely abandoned in this century; nor did either the Greek or Latin church furniſh any writer who attempted to explain in a regular method the doctrines of Chriſtianity. The Greeks were contented with the Works of DAMASCENUS, and the Latins with thoſe of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY, who were now conſidered as the greateſt doctors that had adorned the church. Some added to theſe the writings of venerable BEDE and RABANUS MAURUS. The important ſcience of morals was ſtill more neglected than that of theology in this wretched age, and was reduced to a certain number of dry and inſipid homilies, and to the lives of the ſaints, which SIMEON among the Greeks,

[*b*] *Moralia in Jobum.*

and

and HUBALD, ODO, and STEPHEN [c], among the Latins, had drawn up with a ſeducing eloquence that covered the moſt impertinent fictions. Such was the miſerable ſtate of morals and theology in this century; in which, as we may farther obſerve, there did not appear any defence of the Chriſtian religion againſt its profeſſed enemies.

The controverſies between the Greek and Latin churches.

VII. The controverſies between the Greek and Latin churches were now carried on with leſs noiſe and impetuoſity than in the preceding century, on account of the troubles and calamities of the times; yet they were not entirely reduced to ſilence [d]. The writers therefore who affirm, that this unhappy ſchiſm was healed, and that the contending parties were really reconciled to each other for a certain ſpace of time, have groſsly miſtaken the matter [e]; though it be, indeed, true, that the tumults of the times produced now and then a ceſſation of theſe conteſts, and occaſioned ſeveral truces, which inſidiouſly concealed the bittereſt enmity, and ſerved often as a cover to the moſt treacherous deſigns. The Greeks were, moreover, divided among themſelves, and diſputed with great warmth concerning the lawfulneſs of repeated [f] marriages, to which violent conteſt the caſe of LEO, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, gave riſe. This emperor having buried ſucceſſively three wives without having had by them any male iſſue, eſpouſed a fourth, whoſe

[c] Biſhop of *Liege*.

[d] MICH. LEQUIEN, *Diſſert.* i. *Damaſcenica de proceſſione Spiritus Sancti*, § xiii. p. 12.—FRED. SPANHEIM, *De perpetua diſſenſione Eccleſiæ Oriental. et Occidental.* part IV, § vii. p. 529. tom. ii. opp.

[e] LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua conſenſione Eccleſiæ Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. vii, viii. p. 600.

☞ [f] Fourth marriages, our author undoubtedly means, ſince ſecond and third nuptials were allowed upon certain conditions,

named

name was ZOE CARBINOPSINA, and who was born in the obſcurity of a mean condition. As marriages repeated for the fourth time were held to be impure and unlawful by the Greek canons, NICOLAS, the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, ſuſpended the emperor, upon this occaſion, from the communion of the church. LEO, incenſed at this rigorous proceeding, deprived NICOLAS of the patriarchal dignity, and raiſed EUTHYMIUS to that high office, who, though he re-admitted the emperor to the boſom of the church, yet oppoſed the law which he had reſolved to enact in order to render fourth marriages lawful. Upon this a ſchiſm, attended with the bittereſt animoſities, divided the clergy, one part of which declared for NICOLAS, the other for EUTHYMIUS. Some time after this LEO died, and was ſucceeded in the empire by ALEXANDER, who depoſed EUTHYMIUS, and reſtored NICOLAS to his eminent rank in the church. No ſooner was this warm patriarch reinſtated in his office, than he began to load the memory of the late emperor with the bittereſt execrations and the moſt opprobrious invectives, and to maintain the unlawfulneſs of fourth marriages with the utmoſt obſtinacy. In order to appeaſe theſe tumults, which portended numberleſs calamities to the ſtate, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, the ſon of LEO, called together an aſſembly of the clergy of *Conſtantinople* in the year 920, in which fourth marriages were abſolutely prohibited, and marriages for the third time were permitted on certain conditions; and thus the public tranquillity was reſtored [*g*].

Several other conteſts of like moment aroſe among the Greeks during this century; and they

[*g*] Theſe facts are faithfully collected from CEDRENUS, LEUNCLAVIUS *De Jure Græco-Rom.* tom. i. p. 104. from LEO the Grammarian, SIMEON the Treaſurer, and other writers of the Byzantine hiſtory.

ſerve

ſerve to convince us of the ignorance that prevailed among that people, and of their blind veneration and zeal for the opinions of their anceſtors.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies multiplied.

I. IN order to have ſome notion of the load of ceremonies under which the Chriſtian religion groaned during this ſuperſtitious age, we have only to caſt an eye upon the acts of the various councils which were aſſembled in *England*, *Germany*, *France*, and *Italy*. The number of ceremonies increaſed in proportion to that of the ſaints, which multiplied from day to day; for each new ſaintly patron had appropriated to his ſervice a new feſtival, a new form of worſhip, a new round of religious rites; and the clergy, notwithſtanding their groſs ſtupidity in other matters, diſcovered, in the creation of new ceremonies, a marvellous fertility of invention, attended with the utmoſt dexterity and artifice. It is alſo to be obſerved, that a great part of theſe new rites derived their origin from the various errors which the barbarous nations had received from their anceſtors, and ſtill retained, even after their converſion to Chriſtianity. The clergy, inſtead of extirpating theſe errors, either gave them a Chriſtian aſpect by inventing certain religious rites to cover their deformity, or by explaining them in a forced allegorical manner; and thus they were perpetuated in the church, and devoutly tranſmitted from age to age. We may alſo attribute a conſiderable number of the rites and inſtitutions, that diſhonoured religion in this century,

CENT. X. PART II.

century, to fooliſh notions both concerning the Supreme Being and departed ſaints; for they imagined that God was like the princes and great ones of the earth, who are rendered propitious by coſtly preſents, and are delighted with thoſe cringing ſalutations, and other marks of veneration and homage, which they receive from their ſubjects; and they believed likewiſe, that departed ſpirits were agreeably affected with the ſame kind of ſervices.

Feſtivals.

II. The famous yearly feſtival that was celebrated in remembrance of *all departed ſouls*, was inſtituted by the authority of ODILO, abbot of *Clugni*, and added to the Latin calendar towards the concluſion of this century [*h*]. Before this time, a cuſtom had been introduced in many places of putting up prayers on certain days, for the ſouls that were confined in purgatory; but theſe prayers were made by each religious ſociety, only for its own members, friends, and patrons. The pious zeal of ODILO could not be confined within ſuch narrow limits; and he therefore extended the benefit of theſe prayers to all the ſouls that laboured under the pains and trials of *purgatory* [*i*]. This proceeding of ODILO was owing to the exhortations of a certain Sicilian hermit, who pretended to have learned, by an immediate revelation from heaven, that the prayers of the monks of *Clugni* would be effectual for the deliverance of departed ſpirits from the expiatory flames of a middle ſtate [*k*]. Accordingly this feſtival

[*h*] In the year 998.

[*i*] See MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part I. p. 584. where the reader will find the *Life of Odilo*, with the decree he iſſued forth for the inſtitution of this feſtival.

[*k*] The late pontif BENEDICT XIV. was artful enough to obſerve a profound ſilence with reſpect to the ſuperſtitious and diſhonourable origin of this anniverſary feſtival, in his treatiſe *De Feſtis J. Chriſti, Mariæ, et Sanctorum*, lib. iii. cap. xxii.

festival was, at first, celebrated only by the *congregation of Clugni*; but having received afterwards the approbation of one of the Roman pontifs, it was, by his order, kept with particular devotion in all the Latin churches.

The office of the holy Virgin Mary.

III. The worship of the Virgin MARY, which, before this century, had been carried to a very high degree of idolatry, received now new accessions of solemnity and superstition. Towards the conclusion of this century, a custom was introduced among the Latins of celebrating masses and abstaining from flesh, in honour of the blessed Virgin, every Sabbath day. After this was instituted, what the Latins called the *lesser office*, in honour of St. MARY, which was, in the following century, confirmed by URBAN II. in the council of *Clermont*. There are also to be found in this age manifest indications of the institution of the *rosary*, and *crown* of the Virgin, by which her worshippers were to reckon the number of prayers that they were to offer to this new divinity; for though some place the invention of the *Rosary* in the xiiith century, and attribute it to St. DOMINIC, yet this supposition is made without any foundation [*l*]. The *rosary* consists in fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and an hundred and fifty salutations of the blessed Virgin; while the *crown*, according to the different opinions of the learned concerning the age of the blessed Virgin, consists in six or seven repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and six or seven times ten salutations, or *Ave Marias*.

Institution of the rosary.

p. 671. tom. x. oper. and by his silence he has plainly shewn to the world what he thought of this absurd festival. This is not the only mark of prudence and cunning that is to be found in the works of that famous pontif.

[*l*] This is demonstrated by MABILLON, *Præf. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* v. p. 58.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

CENT. X. PART II.

Ancient hereſies continue.

I. THE profound ignorance and ſtupidity, that were productive of ſo many evils in this century, had at leaſt this advantage attending them; that they contributed much to the tranquillity of the church, and prevented the riſe of new ſects and new commotions of a religious kind. But, though no new inventions were broached, the ancient errors ſtill remained. The Neſtorians and Monophyſites lived ſtill under the Arabian government, where, however, they were much more rigorouſly treated than in former times, and were often perſecuted with the utmoſt injuſtice and violence. But as ſome of them excelled in medical knowledge, which was highly eſteemed among the Arabians, while others rendered themſelves acceptable to the great, by the dexterous management of their domeſtic affairs, as overſeers and ſtewards, all this contributed to diminiſh the violence of the ſtorms that aroſe againſt them from time to time.

The Paulicians.

II. The Manichæans or Paulicians, whoſe errors have been already pointed out, gathered conſiderable ſtrength in *Thrace* under the reign of JOHN TZIMISCES. A great part of this ſect had been tranſported into this province, by the order of CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, ſo early as the ſeventh century, to put an end to the troubles and tumults they had excited in the eaſt; but a ſtill greater number of them were left behind, eſpecially in *Syria* and the adjacent countries. Hence it was, that THEODORE, biſhop of *Antioch*, from a pious apprehenſion of the danger to which his flock lay expoſed from the neighbourhood of

ſuch pernicious heretics, engaged the emperor, by his ardent and importunate ſolicitations, to ſend a new colony of theſe Manichæans from *Syria* to *Philippi* [*m*]. From *Thrace* this reſtleſs and turbulent ſect paſſed into *Bulgaria* and *Sclavonia*, where they reſided under the juriſdiction of their own pontif, or patriarch, until the time of the council of *Baſil*, i. e. until the xvth century. From *Bulgaria* the Paulicians removed to *Italy*, and ſpreading themſelves from thence through the other provinces of *Europe*, they became extremely troubleſome to the Roman pontifs upon many occaſions [*n*].

Troubles excited by Leutard.

III. In the very laſt year of this century aroſe a certain teacher, whoſe name was LEUTARD, who lived at *Vertus*, in the dioceſe of *Chalons*, and, in a ſhort time, drew after him a conſiderable number of diſciples. This new doctor could not bear the ſuperſtitious worſhip of images; which he is ſaid to have oppoſed with the utmoſt vehemence, and even to have broke in pieces an image of CHRIST, which he found in a church where he went to perform his devotions. He, moreover, exclaimed with the greateſt warmth againſt paying tythes to the prieſts, and in ſeveral other reſpects ſhewed that he was no cordial friend to the ſacerdotal order. But that which ſhewed evidently that he was a dangerous fanatic, was his affirming that in the prophecies of the Old Teſtament there was a manifeſt mixture of truth and falſhood. GEBOUIN, biſhop of *Chalons*, examined the pretenſions which this man made to divine inſpiration, and expoſed his extravagance to the view of the public, whom he had ſo artfully ſe-

[*m*] Jo. ZONARAS *Annal.* lib. xvii. p. 209. edit. *Pariſ.* p. 164. edit. *Venet.*

[*n*] It is extremely probable, as we have already had occaſion to obſerve, that the remains of this ſect are ſtill to be found in *Bulgaria*.

duced;

CENT. X. PART II.

duced; upon which he threw himſelf into a well, and ended his days as many fanatics have done after him [o]. It is highly probable, that this upſtart doctor taught many other abſurd notions beſides thoſe which we have now mentioned, and that, after his death, his diſciples made a part of the ſect that was afterwards known in *France* under the name of the Albigenſes, and which is ſaid to have adopted the Manichæan errors.

The Anthropomorphites.

IV. There were yet ſubſiſting ſome remains of the ſect of the Arians in ſeveral parts of *Italy*, and particularly in the territory of *Padua*; but RATHERIUS, biſhop of *Verona*, had a ſtill more enormous hereſy to combat in the ſyſtem of the Anthropomorphites, which was revived in the year 939. In the diſtrict of *Vicenza*, a conſiderable number not only of the illiterate multitude, but alſo of the ſacerdotal order, fell into that moſt abſurd and extravagant notion, that the Deity was clothed with a human form, and ſeated, like an earthly monarch, upon a throne of gold, and that his angelic miniſters were men arrayed in white garments, and furniſhed with wings to render them more expeditious in executing their ſovereign's orders. This monſtrous error will appear leſs aſtoniſhing, when we conſider that the ſtupid and illiterate multitude had conſtantly before their eyes, in all the churches, the Supreme Being and his angels repreſented in pictures and images with the human figure.

The ſuperſtition of another ſet of blinded wretches, mentioned alſo by RATHERIUS, was yet more unaccountable and abſurd than that of the Anthropomorphites; for they imagined that, every Monday, maſs was performed in heaven by St. MICHAEL in the preſence of God; and hence

[o] All this is related by GLABER RADULPHUS, *Hiſt.* lib. iii. cap. xi.

on

on that day they reſorted in crowds to all the churches which were dedicated to that highly-honoured ſaint [*p*]. It is more than probable, that the avarice of the prieſts, who officiated in the church of St. MICHAEL, was the real ſource of this extravagant fancy; and that in this, as in many other caſes, a rapacious clergy took advantage of the credulity of the people, and made them believe whatever they thought would contribute to augment the opulence of the church.

[*p*] RATHERII *Epiſt. Synodica* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Script. Veter.* tom. ii. p. 294.—SIGEBERTUS *Gemblac. Chronol. ad A.* 939.

THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the church during this century.

CENT. XI. PART I.

Chriſtianity propagated.

I. IN the preceding century ſome faint notions of the Chriſtian religion, ſome ſcattered rays of that divine light which it adminiſters to mortals, had been received among the Hungarians, Danes, Poles, and Ruſſians; but the rude and ſavage ſpirit of theſe nations, together with their deplorable ignorance and their violent attachment to the ſuperſtitions of their anceſtors, rendered their total converſion to Chriſtianity a work of great difficulty, and which could not be accompliſhed all of a ſudden. The zeal, however, with which this important work was carried on, did much honour to the piety of the princes and governors of theſe unpoliſhed countries, who united their influence with the labours of the learned men whom they had invited into their dominions, to open the eyes of their ſubjects upon the truth [a].

[a] For an account of the Poles, Ruſſians, and Hungarians, ſee ROMUALDI *Vita in Actis Sanctor.* tom. ii. Februar. p. 113, 114. 117.

In

In *Tartary* [*b*], and the adjacent countries, the zeal and diligence of the Neſtorians gained over daily vaſt numbers to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. It appears alſo evident, from a multitude of unexceptionable teſtimonies, that metropolitan prelates, with a great number of inferior biſhops under their juriſdiction, were eſtabliſhed at this time in the provinces of *Caſgar*, *Nuacheta*, *Turkeſtan*, *Genda*, and *Tangut* [*c*]; from which we may conclude, that, in this and the following century, there was a prodigious number of Chriſtians in thoſe very countries which are at preſent over-run with mahometaniſm and idolatry. All theſe Chriſtians were undoubtedly Neſtorians, and lived under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of that ſect, who reſided in *Chaldæa*.

II. Among the European nations that lay yet groveling in their native darkneſs and ſuperſti-

The converſion of certain nations attempted in vain.

[*b*] *Tartary* is taken here in its moſt comprehenſive ſenſe; for between the inhabitants of *Tartary*, properly ſo called, and the Calmucs, Mogols, and the inhabitants of *Tangut*, there is a manifeſt difference.

[*c*] MARCUS PAUL. VENETUS *De Regionibus Orientalibus*, lib. i. cap. 38. 40. 45. 47, 48, 49. 62, 63, 64. lib. ii. cap. 39. —EUSEB. RENAUDOT *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine*, p. 420.—JOS. SIMON. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part II. p. 502, &c. This ſucceſsful propagation of the goſpel, by the miniſtry of the Neſtorians, in *Tartary*, *China*, and the neighbouring provinces, is a moſt important event, and every way worthy to employ the reſearches and the pen of ſome able writer, well acquainted with oriental hiſtory. It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that, if this ſubject be important, it is alſo difficult on many accounts. It was attempted, however, notwithſtanding its difficulty, by the moſt learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED. BAYER, who had collected a great quantity of materials relative to this intereſting branch of the hiſtory of Chriſtianity, both from the works that have been publiſhed upon this ſubject, and from manuſcripts that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious. But, unhappily for the republic of letters, the death of that excellent man interrupted his labours, and prevented him from executing a deſign, which was worthy of his ſuperior abilities, and his well-known zeal for the intereſts of religion.

CENT. XI. PART I.

tion, were the Sclavonians, the Obotriti [*d*], the Venedi [*e*], and the Pruſſians, whoſe converſion had been attempted, but with little or no ſucceſs, by certain miſſionaries, from whoſe piety and zeal better fruits might have been expected. Towards the concluſion of the preceding century, ADALBERT, biſhop of *Prague*, had endeavoured to inſtil into the minds of the fierce and ſavage Pruſſians, the ſalutary doctrines of the goſpel; but he periſhed in the fruitleſs attempt, and received, in the year 996, from the murdering lance of SIGGO, a Pagan prieſt, the crown of martyrdom [*f*]. BOLESLAUS, king of *Poland*, revenged the death of this pious apoſtle by entering into a bloody war with the Pruſſians, and he obtained by the force of penal laws and of a victorious army, what ADALBERT could not effect by exhortation and argument [*g*]. He dragooned this ſavage people into the Chriſtian church; yet beſides this violent method of converſion, others of a more gentle kind were certainly practiſed by the attendants of BOLESLAUS, who ſeconded the military arguments of their prince by the more perſuaſive influence of admonition and inſtruction. A certain eccleſiaſtic of illuſtrious birth, whoſe name was BONIFACE, and who was one of the diſciples of St. ROMUALD, undertook the converſion of the Pruſſians, and was ſucceeded in this

☞ [*d*] The Obotriti were a great and powerful branch of the Vandals, whoſe kings reſided in the country of *Mecklenburgh*, and whoſe domination extended along the coaſts of the *Baltic* from the river *Pene* in *Pomerania* to the dutchy of *Holſtein*.

☞ [*e*] The Venedi dwelt upon the banks of the *Weiſſell*, or *Viſtula*, in, what is at preſent called, the Palatinate of *Marienburg*.

[*f*] See the *Acta Sanctor. ad d.* xxii Aprilis, p. 174.

[*g*] SOLIGNAC *Hiſt. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 133.

pious

pious enterpriſe by BRUNO [*b*], who ſet out from *Germany* with a company of eighteen perſons, who had entered with zeal into the ſame laudable deſign. Theſe were, however, all barbarouſly maſſacred by the fierce and cruel Pruſſians, and neither the vigorous efforts of BOLESLAUS, nor of the ſucceeding kings of *Poland*, could engage this rude and inflexible nation to abandon totally the idolatry of their anceſtors [*i*].

The Saracens driven out of Sicily.

III. *Sicily* had been groaning under the dominion of the Saracens ſince the ninth century; nor had the repeated attempts of the Greeks and Latins to diſpoſſeſs them of that rich and fertile country, been hitherto crowned with the deſired ſucceſs. But in this century the face of affairs changed entirely in that iſland; for in the year 1059, ROBERT GUISCARD, who had formed a ſettlement in *Italy* at the head of a Norman colony, and was afterwards created duke of *Apulia*, encouraged by the exhortations of the Roman pontif NICHOLAS II., and ſeconded by the aſſiſtance of his brother ROGER, attacked with the greateſt vigour and intrepidity the Saracens in *Sicily*; nor did this latter ſheath the victorious ſword before he had rendered himſelf maſter of that iſland, and cleared it abſolutely of its former tyrants. As ſoon as this great work was accompliſhed, which was not before the year 1090, Count ROGER not only reſtored to its former glory and luſtre the

☞ [*b*] FLEURY differs from Dr. MOSHEIM in his account of *Bruno*, in two points. Firſt he maintains, that *Boniface* and *Bruno* were one and the ſame perſon, and here he is manifeſtly in the right; but he maintains farther, that he ſuffered martyrdom in *Ruſſia*, in which he is evidently miſtaken. It is proper farther to admoniſh the reader to diſtinguiſh carefully the *Bruno* here mentioned, from a monk of the ſame name, who founded the order of the Carthuſians.

[*i*] ANT. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iv. *ad Annum* 1008. p. 97.—CHRIST. HARTKNOCH's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Pruſſia*, book I. ch. i. p. 12.

CENT. XI. PART I.

Chriſtian religion, which had been almoſt totally extinguiſhed under the Saracen yoke, but alſo eſtabliſhed biſhopricks, founded monaſteries, erected magnificent churches throughout that province, and beſtowed upon the clergy thoſe immenſe revenues and thoſe diſtinguiſhed honours which they ſtill enjoy [*k*]. It is in the privileges conferred upon this valiant chief, that we find the origin of that ſupreme authority in matters of religion, which is ſtill veſted in the kings of *Sicily*, within the limits of their own territories, and which is known by the name of the *Sicilian monarchy*; for the Roman pontif URBAN II. is ſaid to have granted, A. D. 1097, by a ſpecial diploma, to ROGER and his ſucceſſors, the title, authority, and prerogatives of hereditary legates of the apoſtolic ſee. The court of *Rome* affirms, that this diploma is not authentic: and hence thoſe warm contentions, about the ſpiritual ſupremacy, that have ariſen even in our times between the biſhops of *Rome* and the kings of *Sicily*. The ſucceſſors of ROGER governed that iſland, under the title of dukes, until the twelfth century, when it was erected into a kingdom [*l*].

Expeditions formed againſt the Saracens in Paleſtine.

IV. The Roman pontifs, from the time of SYLVESTER II., had been forming plans for extending the limits of the church in *Aſia*, and eſpecially for driving the Mahometans out of *Paleſtine*; but the troubles in which *Europe* was ſo long involved, prevented the execution of theſe arduous deſigns. GREGORY VII., the moſt enterpriſing and audacious pontif that ever ſat in the Apoſtolic chair, animated and inflamed by the repeated complaints which the Aſiatic Chriſtians

[*k*] See BURIGNI *Hiſtoire Generale de la Sicile*, tom. i. p. 386.

[*l*] See BARONII *Liber de Monarchia Siciliæ*, tom. xi. *Annal.* as alſo DU PIN *Traité de la Monarchie Sicilienne*.

made

made of the cruelty of the Saracens, reſolved to undertake in perſon a holy war for the deliverance of the church, and upwards of fifty thouſand men were already muſtered to follow him in this bold expedition [*m*]. But his quarrel with the emperor HENRY IV., of which we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter, and other unforeſeen occurrences, obliged him to lay aſide his intended invaſion of the holy land. The project, however, was renewed, towards the concluſion of this century, by the enthuſiaſtic zeal of an inhabitant of *Amiens*, who was known by the name of PETER the Hermit, and who ſuggeſted to the Roman pontif URBAN II. the means of accompliſhing what had been unluckily ſuſpended. This famous hermit, in a voyage which he had made through *Paleſtine* A. D. 1093, had obſerved, with inexpreſſible anguiſh, the vexations and perſecutions which the Chriſtians, who viſited the holy places, ſuffered from the barbarous and tyrannic Saracens. Inflamed therefore with a holy indignation and a furious zeal, which he looked upon as the effects of a divine impulſe, he implored the ſuccours of SYMEON, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and URBAN II., but without effect. Far from being diſcouraged by this, he renewed his efforts with the utmoſt vigour, went through all the countries of *Europe* ſounding the alarm of a *holy war* againſt the infidel nations, and exhorting all Chriſtian princes to draw the ſword againſt the tyrants of *Paleſtine*; nor did he ſtop here; but with a view to engage the ſuperſtitious and ignorant multitude in his cauſe, he carried about with him a letter, which he ſaid was written in heaven, and addreſſed from thence to all true Chriſtians, to animate their zeal for the deliver-

[*m*] GREGORII VII. *Epiſt.* lib. ii. 3. in HARDUINI *Conciliis*, tom. vi. part I. p. 1285.

ance of their brethren, who groaned under the oppreſſive burthen of a Mahometan yoke [*n*].

The progreſs of the holy war.

V. When URBAN II. ſaw the way prepared by the exhortations of the hermit, who had put the ſpirits of the people every where in a ferment, and had kindled in their breaſts a vehement zeal for that holy carnage which the church had been meditating ſo long, he aſſembled a grand and numerous council at *Placentia*, A. D. 1095, and recommended warmly, for the firſt time, the ſacred expedition againſt the infidel Saracens [*o*]. This arduous enterprize was far from being approved of by the greateſt part of this numerous aſſembly, notwithſtanding the preſence of the emperor's legates, who, in their maſter's name, repreſented moſt pathetically how neceſſary it was to ſet limits to the power of the victorious Turks, whoſe authority and dominion increaſed from day to day: The pontif's propoſal was, however, renewed with the ſame zeal, and with the deſired ſucceſs, ſome time after this, in the council aſſembled at *Clermont*, where URBAN was preſent. The pompous and pathetic ſpeech which he delivered upon this occaſion, made a deep and powerful impreſſion upon the minds of the French, whoſe natural character renders them much ſuperior to the Italians in encountering difficulties, facing danger, and attempting the execution of the moſt perilous deſigns. So that an innumerable multitude, compoſed of all ranks and orders

[*n*] This circumſtance is mentioned by the abbot DODECHINUS, in his *Continuat. Chronici Mariani Scoti Scriptor. Germanicor.* Jo. PISTORII, tom. i. p. 462. For an account of PETER, ſee DU FRESNE *Notæ ad Annæ Comnenæ Alexiadem*, p. 79. edit. *Venet.*

☞ [*o*] This council was the moſt numerous of any that had been hitherto aſſembled, and was, on that account, held in the open fields. There were preſent at it two hundred biſhops, four thouſand eccleſiaſtics, and three hundred thouſand laymen.

in

in the nation, offered themſelves as volunteers in this ſacred expedition [*p*]. This numerous hoſt was looked upon as formidable in the higheſt degree, and equal to the moſt glorious enterprizes and exploits, while, in reality, it was no more than an unwieldy body without life and vigour, and was weak and contemptible in every reſpect. This will appear ſufficiently evident, when we conſider that this army was a motley aſſemblage of monks, proſtitutes, artiſts, labourers, lazy tradeſmen, merchants, boys, girls, ſlaves, malefactors, and profligate debauchees, and that it was principally compoſed of the loweſt dregs of the multitude, who were animated ſolely by the proſpect of ſpoil and plunder, and hoped to make their fortunes by this holy campaign. Every one will perceive how little either diſcipline, counſel, or fortitude were to be expected from ſuch a miſerable rabble. This expedition was diſtinguiſhed, in the French language, by the name of a *croiſade*, and all who embarked in it were called *croiſes*, or croſs-bearers; not only becauſe the end of this holy war was to wreſt the croſs of CHRIST out of the hands of the infidels, but alſo on account of the conſecrated croſs of various colours, which every ſoldier wore upon his right ſhoulder [*q*].

The hiſtory of this holy war.

VI. In conſequence of theſe grand preparations, eight hundred thouſand men, in ſeparate bodies, and under different commanders, ſet out for *Conſtantinople* in the year 1096; that having re-

[*p*] THEOD. RUINART. *in Vita Urbani* II., § ccxxv. p. 224. 299. 240. 272. 274. 282. 296. tom. iii. opp. Poſthum.—J. MABILLONI et THEOD. RUINARTI, Jo. HARDUINI *Concilior.* tom. xi. part II., p. 1726.—BARONIUS *Annal. Eccl.* tom. xi. *ad A.* 1095, *n.* xxxii. p. 648.

[*q*] See ABRAH. BZOVIUS *Continuat. Annal. Baronii*, tom. xv. *ad A.* 1410. *n.* ix. p. 322. edit. *Colon.* L'ENFANT *Hiſtoire du Concile de Piſe*, tom. ii. lib. v. p. 60.—The writers who have treated of this holy war are mentioned by Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toto orbe exoriens*, cap. xxx. p. 518.

ceived

ceived there both aſſiſtance and direction from ALEXIS COMNENIUS the Grecian emperor, they might purſue their march into *Aſia*. One of the principal diviſions of this enormous body was led on by PETER the Hermit, the author and fomenter of the war, who was girded with a rope, and continued to appear with all the marks of an auſtere ſolitary. This firſt diviſion, in their march through *Hungary* and *Thrace*, committed the moſt flagitious crimes, which ſo incenſed the inhabitants of the countries through which they paſſed, particularly thoſe of *Hungary* and *Turcomania*, that they roſe up in arms and maſſacred the greateſt part of them. A like fate attended ſeveral other diviſions of the ſame army, who, under the conduct of weak and unſkilful chiefs, wandered about like an undiſciplined band of robbers, plundering the cities that lay in their way, and ſpreading miſery and deſolation whereever they came. The armies, that were headed by illuſtrious commanders, diſtinguiſhed by their birth and their military endowments, arrived more happily at the capital of the Grecian empire. That which was commanded by GODFREY of *Bouillon*, duke of *Lorrain*, who deſerves a place among the greateſt heroes, whether of ancient or modern times [*r*], and, by his brother BALDWIN, was compoſed of eighty thouſand well choſen troops, horſe and foot [*s*], and directed its march through

[*r*] The Benedictine monks have given an ample account of this magnanimous chief, whoſe character was a bright aſſemblage of all chriſtian, civil, and heroic virtues, in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 598.

☞ [*s*] The engaging and illuſtrious virtues of GODFREY had drawn from all parts a prodigious number of volunteers, who were ambitious to fight under his ſtandards. This enormous multitude perplexed, however, the valiant chief, who, on that account, divided it into ſeveral bodies, and finding in PETER the HERMIT the ſame ambitious and military ſpirit that had prevailed in him before his retreat from the world, declared him the general of the firſt diviſion, which was detached

through *Germany* and *Hungary*. Another, which was headed by RAIMOND, earl of *Toulouſe*, paſſed through the Sclavonian territories. ROBERT earl of *Flanders*, ROBERT duke of *Normandy* [*t*], HUGO, brother to PHILIP I., king of *France*, embarked their reſpective forces in a fleet which was aſſembled at *Brundiſi* and *Tarento*, from whence they were tranſported to *Durazzo*, or *Dyrachium*, as it was anciently called. Theſe armies were followed by BOEMOND, duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, at the head of a choſen and numerous body of valiant Normans.

VII. This army was the greateſt, and, in outward appearance, the moſt formidable, that had been known in the memory of man; and, though before its arrival at *Conſtantinople*, it was diminiſhed conſiderably by the difficulties and oppoſitions it had met with on the way; yet, ſuch as it was, it made the Grecian emperor tremble, and filled his mind with the moſt anxious and terrible apprehenſions of ſome ſecret deſign againſt his dominions. His fears, however, were diſpelled, when he ſaw theſe legions paſs the ſtreights of *Galipolis*, and direct their march towards *Bithynia* [*u*].

The

tached from the reſt, and ordered to march immediately to *Conſtantinople*. By this means, GODFREY got rid of the dregs of that aſtoniſhing multitude which flocked to his camp. Father MAIMBOURG, notwithſtanding his immoderate zeal for the holy war, and that fabulous turn which enables him to repreſent it in the moſt favourable points of view, acknowledges frankly, that the firſt diviſions of this prodigious army committed the moſt abominable enormities in the countries through which they paſſed, and that there was no kind of inſolence, injuſtice, impurity, barbarity, and violence of which they were not guilty. Nothing perhaps in the annals of hiſtory can equal the flagitious deeds of this infernal rabble. See particularly MAIMBOURG, *Hiſtoire des Croiſades*, tom. i. livre i. p. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62. 2d ed. in 12mo.

☞ [*t*] Eldeſt ſon of WILLIAM the Conqueror.

☞ [*u*] Our author, for the ſake of brevity, paſſes over the conteſts and jealouſies that ſubſiſted between the chief of the cruſade

CENT. XI. PART I.

The firſt ſucceſsful enterprize [*w*], that was formed againſt the Infidels, was the ſiege of *Nice*, the capital of *Bithynia*, which was taken in the year 1097; from thence the victorious army proceeded into *Syria*, and in the following year ſubdued *Antioch*, which, with its fertile territory, was granted, by the aſſembled chiefs, to BOEMOND, duke of *Apulia*. *Edeſſa* fell next into the hands of the victors, and became the property of BALDWIN, brother to GODFREY of *Bouillon*. The conqueſt of *Jeruſalem*, which, after a ſiege of five weeks, ſubmitted to their arms in the year 1099, ſeemed to crown their expedition with the deſired ſucceſs. In this city were laid the foundations of a new kingdom, at the head of which was placed the famous GODFREY, whom the army ſaluted king of *Jeruſalem* with a unanimous voice. But this illuſtrious hero, whoſe other eminent qualities were adorned with the greateſt modeſty, refuſed that high title [*x*], though he governed *Jeruſalem*

cruſade and the Grecian emperor. The character of the latter is differently painted by different hiſtorians. The warm defenders of the cruſade repreſent him as a moſt perfidious prince, who, under the ſhew of friendſhip and zeal, aimed at nothing leſs than the deſtruction of GODFREY's army. Others conſider him as a wiſe, prudent politician, who, by artifice and ſtratagem, warded off the danger he had reaſon to apprehend from theſe formidable legions that paſſed through his dominions; and part of which, particularly the army commanded by PETER the HERMIT, ravaged his moſt fruitful territories in the moſt barbarous manner, and pillaged and plundered even the ſuburbs of the capital of the empire. The truth of the matter is, that if ALEXIS cannot be vindicated from the charge of perfidy, the holy warriors are, on the other hand, chargeable with many acts of brutality and injuſtice. See MAIMBOURG, *Hiſtoire des Croiſades*, livre i. et ii.

☞ [*w*] Before the arrival of GODFREY in *Aſia*, the army, or rather rabble, commanded by PETER the Hermit in ſuch a ridiculous manner as might be expected from a wrong-headed monk, was defeated and cut to pieces by the young SOLIMAN.

☞ [*x*] All the hiſtorians, who write concerning this holy war, applaud the anſwer which GODFREY returned to the of-

Jeruſalem with that valour, equity and prudence that have rendered his name immortal. Having choſen a ſmall army to ſupport him in his new dignity, he permitted the reſt of the troops to return into *Europe*. He did not, however, enjoy long the fruits of a victory, in which his heroic valour had been ſo gloriouſly diſplayed, but died about a year after the conqueſt of *Jeruſalem*, leaving his dominions to his brother BALDWIN, prince of *Edeſſa*, who aſſumed the title of King without the leaſt heſitation.

The motives which engaged the biſhops of Rome and the princes of Europe in this holy war.

VIII. If we examine the motives that engaged the Roman pontifs, and particularly URBAN II. to kindle this holy war, which in its progreſs and iſſue was ſo detrimental to almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, we ſhall probably be perſuaded that its origin is to be derived from the corrupt notions of religion, which prevailed in theſe barbarous times. It was thought inconſiſtent with the duty and character of Chriſtians, to ſuffer that land, that was bleſſed with the miniſtry, diſtinguiſhed by the miracles, and conſecrated by the blood of the Saviour of men, to remain under the dominion of his moſt inveterate enemies. It was alſo looked upon as a very important branch of true piety to viſit the holy places in *Paleſtine*; which pilgrimages, however, were extremely dangerous, while the deſpotic Saracens were in poſſeſſion of that country. Nor is it to be denied, that theſe motives of a religious kind were accompanied and rendered more effectual by an anxious apprehenſion of the growing power of the Turks, who had already ſubdued the greateſt part of the Grecian empire, and might ſoon carry into *Eu-*

ſer that was made him of a crown of gold, as a mark of his acceſſion to the throne of *Jeruſalem*; the anſwer was, that *he could not bear the thoughts of wearing a crown of gold in that city, where the* KING OF KINGS *had been crowned with thorns.* This anſwer was ſublime in the eleventh century.

rope,

CENT. XI. PART I.

rope, and more particularly into *Italy*, their victorious arms.

There are, it must be confessed, several learned men who have accounted otherwise for this pious, or rather fanatical, expedition. They imagine that the Roman pontifs recommended this sacred campaign with a view to augment their own authority, and to weaken the power of the Latin emperors and princes; and that these princes countenanced and encouraged it in hopes of getting rid, by that means, of their more powerful and warlike vassals, and of becoming masters of their lands and possessions [*y*]. These conjectures, however

[*y*] The part of this hypothesis that relates to the views of the Roman pontifs, has been adopted as an undoubted truth, not only by many protestant historians, but also by several writers of the Roman communion. See BENED. ACCOLTUS *De bello Sacro in Infideles*, lib. i. p. 16.—BASNAGE *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i. period v. p. 235.—VERTOT *Histoire des Chevaliers de Malthe*, tom. i. livre iii. p. 302. 308. livre iv. p. 428.—BAILLET *Histoire des demelez du Boniface* VIII., *avec Philippe le Bel.* p. 76.—*Histoire du droit Ecclesiastique François*, tom. i. 296. 299. To such, however, as consider matters attentively, this hypothesis will appear destitute of any solid foundation. Certain it is, that the Roman pontifs could never have either foreseen, or imagined, that so many European princes, and such prodigious multitudes of people, would take arms against the infidels, and march into *Palestine*; nor could they be assured beforehand, that this expedition would tend to the advancement of their opulence and authority. For all the accessions of influence and wealth, which the Roman pontifs, and the clergy in general, derived from these holy wars, were of a much later date, than their first origin, and were acquired by degrees, rather by lucky hits, than by deep-laid schemes; and this alone is sufficient to shew, that the bishops of *Rome*, in forming the plan and exhorting to the prosecution of these wars, had no thoughts of extending thereby the limits of their authority. We may add to this consideration another of no less weight in the matter before us, and that is, the general opinion which prevailed at this time, both among the clergy and the people, that the conquest of *Palestine* would be finished in a short time, in a single campaign; that the Divine Providence would interpose, in a miraculous manner, to accomplish the ruin of the infidels; and that, after the taking of

however plauſible in appearance, are ſtill no more than conjectures. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this; that the Roman pontifs and the Eu-

CENT. XI. PART I.

of *Jeruſalem*,' the greateſt part of the European princes would return home with their troops, which laſt circumſtance was by no means favourable to the views which the pontifs are ſuppoſed to have formed of increaſing their opulence and extending their dominion. Of all the conjectures that have been entertained upon this ſubject, the moſt improbable and groundleſs is that which ſuppoſes that URBAN II. recommended, with ſuch ardour, this expedition into *Paleſtine*, with a view to weaken the power of the emperor Henry IV., with whom he had a violent diſpute concerning the inveſtiture of biſhops. They, who adopt this conjecture, muſt be little acquainted with the hiſtory of theſe times; or at leaſt they forget, that the firſt armies, that marched into *Paleſtine* againſt the infidels, were chiefly compoſed of Franks and Normans, and that the Germans, who were the enemies of URBAN II. were, in the beginning, extremely averſe to this ſacred expedition. Many other conſiderations might be added here to illuſtrate this matter, which, for the ſake of brevity, I paſs in ſilence.

That part of the hypotheſis, which relates to the kings and princes of *Europe*, and ſuppoſes that they countenanced the holy war, to get rid of their powerful vaſſals, is as groundleſs as the other, which we have been now refuting. It is, indeed, adopted by ſeveral eminent writers, ſuch as VERTOT (*Hiſt. de Malthe*, livre iii. p. 309.), BOULAINVILLIERS, and others, who pretend to a ſuperior and uncommon inſight into the policy of theſe remote ages. The reaſons, however, which theſe great men employ to ſupport their opinion, may be all comprehended in this ſingle argument: *viz.* "Many kings, eſpecially among the Franks, became more opulent and powerful by the number of their vaſſals, who loſt their lives and fortunes in his holy war; *therefore*, theſe princes not only permitted, but warmly countenanced the proſecution of this war from ſelfiſh and ambitious principles." The weakneſs of this concluſion muſt ſtrike every one at firſt ſight. We are wonderfully prone to attribute both to the Roman pontifs, and the princes of this barbarous age, much more ſagacity and cunning than they really poſſeſſed; and we deduce from the events, the principles and views of the actors, which is a defective and uncertain manner of reaſoning. With reſpect to the Roman pontifs, it appears moſt probable that their immenſe opulence and authority were acquired, rather by their improving dexterouſly the opportunities that were offered them, than by the ſchemes they formed for extending their dominion, or filling their coffers.

ropean

CENT. XI. PART I.

ropean princes were engaged at first in these *crusades* by a principle of superstition only; but when, in process of time, they learned by experience, that these holy wars contributed much to increase their opulence and to extend their authority, by sacrificing their wealthy and powerful rivals, then new motives were presented to encourage these sacred expeditions into *Palestine*, and ambition and avarice seconded and enforced the dictates of fanaticism and superstition.

Its unhappy consequences, and the innumerable evils that attended it.

IX. Without determining any thing concerning the justice or injustice [z] of these holy wars, we

[z] I do not pretend to decide the question concerning the lawfulness of the crusades; a question, which, when it is considered with attention and impartiality, will appear not only extremely difficult, but also highly doubtful. It is, however, proper to inform the reader, that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the justice of this holy war was called in question, and warmly disputed among Christians. The Waldenses and Albigenses, who were distinguished by the name of Cathari, or Puritans, considered these expeditions into *Palestine* as absolutely unlawful. The reasons they alledged were collected and combated by FRANCIS MONETA, a Dominican friar of the thirteenth century, in a book entitled *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses*, lib. v. cap. xiii. p. 531. which was published some years ago at *Rome* by RICHINI. But neither the objections of the Waldenses, nor the answers of MONETA, were at all remarkable for their weight and solidity, as will appear evidently from the following example: The former objected to the holy war the words of St. PAUL, 1 COR. x. 32. *Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles.* By the *Gentiles*, said they, are to be understood the Saracens. And therefore the European Christians are to abstain from making war upon the Saracens, lest they give offence to the *Gentiles*. We shall give MONETA's answer to this argument in his own words: *We read*, says he, GENES. xii. 7. *that God said unto Abraham, Unto thy seed will I give this land: Now we* (Christians who dwell in *Europe*) *are the seed of Abraham, as the apostle affirms*, GALAT. iii. 29. *Therefore we are heirs of the promise, and the holy land is given to us by the covenant as our lawful possession. From all which it appears, that it is the duty of civil and temporal rulers to use their most zealous efforts to put us in possession of the promised land, while it is, at the same time, incumbent upon the church and its ministers to exhort these rulers in the most urgent manner to the performance*

we may boldly affirm, that they were highly prejudicial both to the cauſe of religion, and to the civil intereſts of mankind, and that, in *Europe* more eſpecially, they were fruitful of innumerable evils and calamities, whoſe effects are yet perceivable in our times. The European nations were deprived of the greateſt part of their inhabitants by theſe ill-judged expeditions; immenſe ſums of money were exported into *Aſia* for the ſupport of the war; and numbers of the moſt powerful and opulent families became either extinct, or were

performance of their duty. A rare argument this *truly!* but let us hear him out: *The church has no deſign to injure or ſlaughter the Saracens, nor is ſuch the intention of the Chriſtian princes engaged in this war. Yet the blood of the infidels muſt of neceſſity be ſhed, if they make reſiſtance and oppoſe the victorious arms of the princes. The church of God therefore is entirely innocent and without reproach in this matter, and gives no offence to the Gentiles, becauſe it does no more, in reality, than maintain its undoubted right.* Such is the ſubtile reaſoning of MONETA, on which it is not neceſſary to make any reflections.

☞ Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems too modeſt, nay even timorous in his manner of expreſſing himſelf concerning the juſtice of this holy war, which was ſo abſurd in its principle, and ſo abominable in the odious circumſtances that attended it. His reſpect, perhaps, for the Teutonic croſſes which abound in *Germany*, and are the marks of an order which derives its origin from theſe fanatical expeditions into *Paleſtine*, may have occaſioned that ambiguity and circumſpection in his expreſſions, through which, however, it is eaſy to perceive his diſapprobation of the cruſades. The holy place profaned by the dominion of infidels, was the apparent pretext for this fanatical war. What holy place? *Jeruſalem*, ſay the knights errant of *Paleſtine*. But they forget that *Jeruſalem* was a city, which by the conduct of its inhabitants and the crucifixion of CHRIST, was become moſt odious in the eye of GOD; that it was viſibly loaded with a divine malediction, and was the miſerable theatre of the moſt tremendous judgments and calamities that ever were inflicted upon any nation. Had the caſe been otherwiſe, we know of no right which Chriſtianity gives its profeſſors to ſeize upon the territories and invade the poſſeſſions of unbelievers. Had the Jews attempted the conqueſt of *Paleſtine*, they would have acted conformably with their apparent rights; becauſe it was formerly their country; and conſiſtently alſo with their religious principles; becauſe they expected a Meſſiah who was to *bind the kings of the Gentiles in chains*, and to reduce the whole world under the Jewiſh yoke.

CENT. XI. PART I.

involved in the deepeſt miſeries of poverty and want. It could not well be otherwiſe; ſince the heads of the moſt illuſtrious houſes either mortgaged or ſold their lands and poſſeſſions in order to pay the expences of their voyage [*a*]; while others impoſed ſuch intolerable burthens upon their vaſſals and tenants, as obliged them to abandon their houſes, and all their domeſtic concerns, and to enliſt themſelves, rather through wild deſpair than religious zeal, under the ſacred banner of the croſs. Hence the face of *Europe* was totally changed, and all things thrown into the utmoſt confuſion. We paſs in ſilence the various enormities that were occaſioned by theſe cruſades, the murders, rapes, and robberies of the moſt infernal nature, that were every where committed with impunity by theſe holy ſoldiers of GOD and of CHRIST, as they were impiouſly called; nor ſhall we enter into a detail of the new privileges and rights, to which theſe wars gave riſe, and which were often attended with the greateſt inconveniencies [*b*].

X. Theſe

[*a*] We find many memorable examples of this in the ancient rẽcords. ROBERT, duke of *Normandy*, mortgaged his dutchy to his brother WILLIAM, king of *England*, to defray the expences of his voyage to *Paleſtine*. See the *Hiſtor. Major* of MATTHEW PARIS, lib. i. p. 24.—ODO, Viſcount of *Bourges*, ſold his territory to the king of *France*. *Gallia Chriſtian. Benedictinorum*, tom. ii. p. 45. See, for many examples of this kind, CAR. DU FRESNE, *Adnot. ad Joinvilli vitam Ludovici S.* p. 52. BOULAINVILLIERS, *Sur l' origine et les droits de la Nobleſſe* in MOLET's *Memoires de Litterature et de l' Hiſtoire*, tom. ix. part I. p. 68.—Jo. GEORGE CRAMER *De juribus et prærogativis Nobilitatis*, tom. i. p. 81. 409. From the commencement therefore of theſe holy wars, a vaſt number of eſtates, belonging to the European nobility, were either mortgaged, or totally transferred, ſome to kings and princes, others to prieſts and monks, and not a few to perſons of a private condition, who, by poſſeſſing conſiderable ſums of ready money, were enabled to make advantageous purchaſes.

[*b*] Such perſons as entered into theſe expeditions, and were diſtinguiſhed by the badge of the military croſs, acquired thereby

X. Theſe holy wars were not leſs prejudicial to the cauſe of religion, and the true intereſts of the Chriſtian church, than they were to the temporal concerns of men. One of their firſt and moſt pernicious effects was the enormous augmentation of the influence and authority of the Roman pontifs: they alſo contributed, in various ways, to enrich the churches and monaſteries with daily acceſſions of wealth, and to open new ſources of opulence to all the ſacerdotal orders. For they, who aſſumed the croſs, diſpoſed of their poſſeſſions as if they were at the point of death, and this on account of the imminent and innumerable dangers they were to be expoſed to in their paſſage to the holy land, and the oppoſition they were to encounter there upon their arrival [*c*]. They therefore, for the moſt part, made their wills before their departure, and left a conſiderable part of their poſſeſſions to the prieſts and monks, in order to obtain, by theſe *pious* legacies, the favour and protection of the Deity [*d*]. Many examples of theſe donations are to be found in ancient records. Such of the *holy* ſoldiers, as had been engaged in ſuits of law with the prieſts or monks, renounced their pretenſions, and ſubmiſſively gave up whatever it was that had been the

Its unhappy effects, conſidered with reſpect to the ſtate of religion.

thereby certain remarkable rights, which were extremely prejudicial to the reſt of their fellow-citizens. Hence it happened, that when any of theſe *holy* ſoldiers contracted any civil obligations, or entered into conventions of ſale, purchaſe, or any ſuch tranſactions, they were previouſly required to *renounce all privileges and immunities*, which they had obtained or might obtain in time to come by taking on the croſs. See LE BOEUF, *Memoires ſur l' Hiſtoire d' Auxerre, Append.* tom. ii. p. 292.

☞ [*c*] The tranſlator has here inſerted into the text, the note [*r*] of the original, as it is purely hiſtorical, and makes a very intereſting part of the narration.

[*d*] See PLESSIS *Hiſt. de Meaux*, tom. ii. p. 76. 79. 141.—*Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. p. 138, 139.—LE BOEUF, *Memoires pour l' Hiſtoire d' Auxerre*, tom. ii. *Append.* p. 31.—DU FRESNE, *Notæ ad Vitam Ludovici Sancti, p.* 52.

ſubject of debate. And others, who had ſeized upon any of the poſſeſſions of the churches or convents, or had heard of any injury that had been committed againſt the clergy, by the remoteſt of their anceſtors, made the moſt liberal reſtitution, both for their own uſurpations and thoſe of their forefathers, and made ample ſatisfaction for the real or pretended injuries they had committed againſt the church by rich and coſtly donations [*e*].

Nor were theſe the only unhappy effects of theſe holy expeditions, conſidered with reſpect to their influence upon the ſtate of religion, and the affairs of the Chriſtian church. For while whole legions of biſhops and abbots girded the ſword to their thigh, and went as generals, volunteers, or chaplains into *Paleſtine*, the prieſts and monks, who had lived under their juriſdiction, and were more or leſs awed by their authority, threw off all reſtraint, lived the moſt lawleſs and profligate lives, and abandoned themſelves to all ſorts of licentiouſneſs, committing the moſt flagitious and extravagant exceſſes without reluctance or remorſe. The monſter ſuperſtition, which was already grown to an enormous ſize, received new acceſſions of ſtrength and influence by this holy war, and exerciſed with more vehemence than ever its deſpotic dominion over the minds of the Latins. For the crowd of ſaints, and tutelary patrons, whoſe number was prodigious before this period, was now augmented by fictitious ſaints of Greek and Syrian origin [*f*], which had hitherto

[*e*] DU FRESNE, l. c. p. 52.

[*f*] The Roman catholic hiſtorians acknowledge, that, during the time of the cruſades, many ſaints, unknown to the Latins before that period, were imported into *Europe* from *Greece* and the eaſtern provinces, and were treated with the utmoſt reſpect and the moſt devout veneration. Among theſe new patrons, there were ſome, whoſe exploits, and even their exiſtence,

hitherto been unknown in *Europe*, and an incredible quantity of relics, the greateſt part of which were ridiculous in the higheſt degree, were imported into the European churches. The armies, that returned from *Aſia* after the taking of *Jeruſalem*, brought with them a vaſt number of theſe ſaintly relics, which they bought at a high price from the cunning Greeks and Syrians, and which they conſidered as the nobleſt ſpoils that could crown their return from the holy land. Theſe they committed to the cuſtody of the clergy in the churches and monaſteries, or ordered them to be moſt carefully preſerved in their families from generation to generation [*g*].

CHAP.

iſtence, were called in queſtion. Such, among others, was St. CATHARINE, whom BARONIUS and CASSANDER repreſent as having removed from *Syria* into *Europe*. See BARONIUS, *Ad Martyrol. Roman.* p. 728.—GEORGE CASSANDER *Schol. ad hymnos Eccleſiæ*, p. 278, 279, opp. *Pariſ.* 1616, *Fol.* It is, however, extremely doubtful, whether or no this CATHARINE, who is honoured as the patroneſs of learned men, ever exiſted.

[*g*] The ſacred treaſures of muſty relics, which the French, Germans, Britons, and other European nations, preſerved formerly with ſo much care, and ſhew even in our times with ſuch pious oſtentation, are certainly not more ancient than theſe holy wars, but were then purchaſed at a high rate from the Greeks and Syrians. Theſe cunning traders in ſuperſtition, whoſe avarice and fraud were exceſſive, impoſed upon the credulity of the ſimple and ignorant Latins, and often ſold them fictitious relics. RICHARD, king of *England*, bought, in the year 1191, from the famous SALADIN, all the relics that were to be found in *Jeruſalem*, as appears from the teſtimony of MATTHEW DE PARIS, *Hiſt. Major.* p. 138. who tells us alſo, p. 666. of the ſame work, that the Dominicans brought from *Paleſtine* a white ſtone, in which Jeſus Chriſt had left the print of his feet. The Genoeſe pretend to have received from BALDWIN, ſecond king of *Jeruſalem*, the very diſh in which the paſchal lamb was ſerved up to Chriſt and his diſciples at the laſt ſupper; though this famous diſh excites the laughter of even father LABAT, in his *Voyages en Eſpagne et en Italie*, tom. ii. p. 63. For an account of the prodigious quantity of relics, which St. LOUIS brought from *Paleſtine* into *France*, we refer the reader to the life of that prince compoſed by JOINVILLE, and publiſhed by DU FRESNE; as alſo to PLESSIS,

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. XI. PART I.

The ſufferings of the church under the dominion and uſurpations of the Saracens and Turks.

I. THE greateſt oppoſition the Chriſtians met with, in this century, was from the Saracens and Turks. To the latter the Chriſtians and Saracens were equally odious, and felt equally the fatal conſequences of their increaſing dominion. The Saracens, notwithſtanding their bloody conteſts with the Turks, which gave them conſtant occupation, and the vigorous, though ineffectual, efforts they were continually making to ſet limits to the power of that fierce nation, which was daily extending the bounds of its empire, perſiſted ſtill in their cruelty towards their Chriſtian ſubjects, whom they robbed, plundered, maimed, or murdered in the moſt barbarous manner, and loaded with all ſorts of injuries and calamities. The Turks, on the other hand, not only reduced the Saracen dominion to very narrow bounds; but alſo ſeized upon the richeſt provinces of the Grecian empire, thoſe fertile countries that lay upon the coaſts of the *Euxine* ſea, and ſub-

Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe de Meaux, tom. i. p. 120. and LANCELOT, *Memoires pour la vie de l'Abbé de St. Cyran*, tom. ii. p. 175. CHRIST's handkerchief, which is worſhipped at *Benzançon*, was brought there from the holy land. See Jo. JAC. CHIFLET, *Viſontio*, part II. p. 108. and *De Linteis Chriſti Sepulchralibus*, c. ix. p. 50. Many other examples of this miſerable ſuperſtition may be ſeen in ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 677.—Jo. MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 52. and principally CHIFLET's *Criſis Hiſtorica de Linteis Chriſti Sepulchralibus*, c. ix, x. p. 50. and alſo 59. where we find the following paſſage: *Sciendum eſt, vigenti immani et barbara Turcarum perſecutione et imminente Chriſtianæ religionis in oriente naufragio, educta e Sacrariis et per Chriſtianos quovis modo recondita Eccleſiæ pignora . . . Hiſce planè divinis opibus illecti præ aliis, Sacra Λειψανα qua vi, quo pretio, à detinentibus hac illac extorſerunt.*

jected

jected them to their yoke, while they impoverished and exhausted the rest by perpetual incursions, and by the most severe and unmerciful exactions. The Greeks were not able to oppose this impetuous torrent of prosperous ambition. Their force was weakened by intestine discords, and their treasures were exhausted to such a degree as rendered them incapable of raising new troops, or of paying the armies they had already in their service.

II. The Saracens in *Spain* opposed the progress of the gospel in a different, yet still more pernicious, way. They used all sorts of methods to allure the Christians into the profession of mahometanism; alliances of marriage, advantageous contracts, flattering rewards, were employed to seduce them with too much success; for great numbers fell into these fatal snares, and apostatized from the truth [*b*]. And these allurements would have, undoubtedly, still continued to seduce multitudes of Christians from the bosom of the church, had not the face of affairs been changed in *Spain* by the victorious arms of the kings of *Arragon* and *Castile*, and more especially FERDINAND I.; for these princes, whose zeal for Christianity was equal to their military courage, defeated the Saracens in several battles, and deprived them of a great part of their territories and possessions [*i*].

And in the western provinces.

The number of those among the Danes, Hungarians, and other European nations, who retained their prejudices in favour of the idolatrous

[*b*] Jo. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Histor. Ecclesiast. Sæc.* xi. § ii. p. 452. MICHAEL GEDDES's *History of the Expulsion of the Moriscoes out of Spain*, which is to be found in the *Miscellaneous Tracts of that Author*, tom. i. p. 104.

[*i*] For an account of these wars between the first Christian kings of *Spain* and the Mahometans or Moors, see the Spanish histories of Jo. MARIANA and Jo. FERRERA.

CENT. XI. PART I.

religion of their anceſtors, was as yet very conſiderable; and they perſecuted, with the utmoſt cruelty, the neighbouring nations, and alſo ſuch of their fellow-citizens as had embraced the goſpel. To put a ſtop to this barbarous perſecution, Chriſtian princes exerted their zeal in a terrible manner, proclaiming capital puniſhment againſt all who perſiſted in the worſhip of the Pagan deities. This dreadful ſeverity contributed much more towards the extirpation of paganiſm, than the exhortations and inſtructions of ignorant miſſionaries, who were unacquainted with the true nature of the goſpel, and diſhonoured its pure and holy doctrines by their licentious lives, and their ſuperſtitious practices.

The Pruſſians, Lithuanians, Sclavonians, Obotriti, and ſeveral other nations, who dwelt in the lower parts of *Germany*, and lay ſtill groveling in the darkneſs of paganiſm, continued to vex the Chriſtians, who lived in their neighbourhood, by perpetual acts of hoſtility and violence, by frequent incurſions into their territories, and by putting numbers of them to death in the moſt inhuman manner [*k*].

[*k*] HELMOLDI *Chron. Slavorum*, lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 52.—ADAM. *Bremenſ. Hiſtor.* lib. ii. cap. xxvii.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning among the Greeks.

I. THE declining condition of the Grecian empire was fatal to the progreſs of letters and philoſophy. Its glory and power diminiſhed from day to day under the inſults and uſurpations of the Turks and Saracens; and while the empire ſuffered by theſe attacks from without, it was conſumed gradually by the internal peſtilence of civil diſcord, by frequent ſeditions and conſpiracies, and by thoſe violent revolutions which ſhook from time to time the imperial throne, and were attended with the ſudden fall and elevation of thoſe that held the reins of government [*a*]. So many foreign invaſions, ſo many internal troubles, ſo many emperors dethroned, deprived the political body of its ſtrength and conſiſtence, broke in upon the public order, rendered all things precarious, and, dejecting the ſpirits of the nation, damped the fire of genius, and diſcouraged the efforts of literary ambition. There were, however, ſome emperors, ſuch as ALEXIUS COMNENUS, who ſeemed to cheriſh and encourage the drooping ſciences, and whoſe zeal was ſeconded by ſeveral prelates, who were willing to lend a

☞ [*a*] The ſentence which begins with the words *ſo many foreign*, and ends with the words *literary ambition*, is added by the tranſlator to render the connexion with what follows more evident.

ſupporting

CENT. XI. PART II.

ſupporting hand to the cauſe of letters. The controverſies alſo that ſubſiſted between the Greeks and Latins, obliged the former, amidſt all their diſadvantages, to a certain degree of application to ſtudy, and prevented them from abandoning entirely the culture of the ſciences. And hence it is, that we find among the Greeks of this century ſome writers, at leaſt, who have deſerved well of the republic of letters.

The principal Greek writers.

II. We paſs in ſilence the poets, rhetoricians, and philologiſts of this century, who were neither highly eminent, nor abſolutely contemptible. Among the writers of hiſtory, LEO the *grammarian*, JOHN SCYLIZES, CEDRENUS, and a few others deſerve to be mentioned with a certain degree of approbation; notwithſtanding the partiality with which they are chargeable, and the zeal they diſcover for many of the fabulous records of their nation. But the greateſt ornament of the republic of letters at this time, was MICHAEL PSELLUS, a man illuſtrious in every reſpect, and deeply verſed in all the various kinds of erudition that were known in this age. This great man recommended warmly to his countrymen the ſtudy of philoſophy, and particularly the ſyſtem of ARISTOTLE, which he embelliſhed and illuſtrated in ſeveral learned and ingenious productions [*b*]. If we turn our eyes towards the Arabians, we ſhall find that they ſtill retained a high degree of zeal for the culture of the ſciences; as appears evidently from the number of phyſicians, mathematicians, and aſtronomers, who flouriſhed among them in this century [*c*].

The ſtate of letters in the weſt.

III. The arts and ſciences ſeemed, in ſome meaſure, to revive in the weſt, among the clergy,

[*b*] LEO ALLATIUS, *Diatriba De Pſellis*, p. 14. edit. *Fabricii*.

[*c*] ELMACINI *Hiſtoria Saracen.* p. 281.—Jo. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xi. p. 449.

at

at leaſt, and the monaſtic orders; they were not indeed cultivated by any other ſet of men, and the nobility, if we except ſuch of them as were deſigned to fill certain eccleſiaſtical dignities, or had voluntarily devoted themſelves to a religious ſolitude, treated all ſorts of learning and erudition with indifference and contempt. The ſchools of learning flouriſhed in ſeveral parts of *Italy* about the year 1050; and of the Italian doctors, who acquired a name by their writings or their academical leſſons, ſeveral removed afterwards into *France*, and particulary into *Normandy*, where they inſtructed the youth, who had conſecrated themſelves to the ſervice of the church [*d*]. The French alſo, though they acknowledge their obligations to the learned Italians who ſettled in their provinces, yet give us, at the ſame time, a conſiderable liſt of their own countrymen, who, without any foreign ſuccours, cultivated the ſciences, and contributed not a little to the advancement of letters in this century; they mention alſo ſeveral ſchools erected in different parts of that kingdom, which were in the higheſt reputation, both on account of the fame of their maſters, and the multitude of diſciples that reſorted to them [*e*]. And, indeed, it is certain beyond all contradiction, that the liberal arts and ſciences were cultivated in *France*, which abounded with learned men, while the greateſt part of *Italy* lay as yet covered with a thick cloud of ignorance and darkneſs. For ROBERT, king of *France*, ſon and ſucceſſor of HUGH CAPET, diſciple of the famous

[*d*] See MURATORI *Antiquitates Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 871.—GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 148.

[*e*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. at the *Introduction*.—DU BOULAY, *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 355.—LE BOEUF, *Diſſ. ſur l'Etat des Sciences en France depuis la mort du Roi Robert*, which is publiſhed among his *Diſſertations ſur l'Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique et Civile de Pariſ.* tom. ii. part I.

GERBERT,

CENT. XI. PART II.

GERBERT, afterwards SYLVESTER II, and the great protector of the ſciences, and friend of the learned, reigned ſo early as the year 1031 [*f*], and exerted upon all occaſions the moſt ardent zeal for the reſtoration of letters; nor were his generous efforts without ſucceſs [*g*]. The provinces of *Sicily*, *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and other ſouthern parts of *Italy*, were indebted, for the introduction of the ſciences among them, to the Normans, who became their maſters, and who brought with them from *France* the knowledge of letters to a people that ſat benighted in the darkeſt ignorance. To the Normans alſo was due the reſtoration of letters in *England*. WILLIAM the Conqueror, a prince of uncommon ſagacity and genius, and the great Mæcenas of his time, upon his acceſſion to the throne of *England* in the year 1066, engaged, by the moſt alluring ſolicitations, a conſiderable number of learned men from *Normandy*, and other countries, to ſettle in his new dominions, and exerted his moſt zealous endeavours to diſpel that ſavage ignorance, that is always a ſource of innumerable evils [*h*]. The reception of Chriſtianity had poliſhed and civilized, in an extraordinary manner, the rugged minds of the valiant Normans; for thoſe fierce warriors, who, under the darkneſs of paganiſm, had manifeſted the utmoſt averſion to all branches of knowledge and every kind of inſtruction, diſtinguiſhed themſelves, after their converſion, by their ardent

☞ [*f*] ROBERT died in the year 1031, after a reign of thirty-five years.

[*g*] DANIEL, *Hiſtoire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 58.—DU BOULAY, *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 636. *et paſſim.*

[*h*] See *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 171.—*The Engliſh*, ſays MATTHEW PARIS, *were ſo illiterate and ignorant before the time of* WILLIAM *the Conqueror, that a man who underſtood the principles of Grammar, was univerſally looked upon as a prodigy of learning.*

application

application to the ſtudy of religion and the purſuit of learning.

IV. This vehement deſire of knowledge, that increaſed from day to day, and became, at length, the predominant paſſion of the politeſt European nations, produced many happy effects. To it, more particularly, we muſt attribute the conſiderable number of public ſchools that were opened in various places, and the choice of more able and eminent maſters, than thoſe who had formerly preſided in the ſeminaries of learning. Towards the concluſion of the preceding age, there were no ſchools in *Europe* but thoſe which belonged to monaſteries, or epiſcopal reſidences, nor were there any other maſters, except the Benedictine monks, to inſtruct the youth in the principles of ſacred and profane erudition. But, not long after the commencement of this century, the face of things was totally changed, and that in a manner the moſt advantageous to the cauſe of letters. In many cities of *France* and *Italy*, learned men, both among the clergy and laity, undertook the weighty and important charge of inſtructing the youth, and ſucceeded much better in this worthy undertaking than the monks had done, not only by comprehending in their courſe of inſtruction more branches of knowledge than the monaſtic doctors were acquainted with, but alſo by teaching in a better method, and with more perſpicuity and ſucceſs, many of the ſame branches of ſcience, which the others had taught before them. The moſt eminent of theſe new maſters were ſuch as had either travelled into *Spain* with a view to ſtudy in the ſchools of the Saracens (which was extremely cuſtomary in this age among thoſe that were ambitious of a diſtinguiſhed reputation for wiſdom and knowledge), or had improved their ſtock of erudition and philoſophy by a diligent and attentive peruſal of the writings

Schools opened in ſeveral places.

CENT. XI. PART II.

writings of the Arabians, of which a great number were tranſlated into Latin. For with theſe foreign ſuccours they were enabled to teach philoſophy, mathematics, phyſic, aſtronomy, and the other ſciences that are connected with them, in a much more learned and ſolid manner than the monks, or ſuch as had received their education from them alone. The ſchool of *Salernum*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, was renowned above all others for the ſtudy of phyſic in this century, and vaſt numbers crowded thither from all the provinces of *Europe* to receive inſtruction in the art of healing: but the medical precepts which rendered the doctors of *Salernum* ſo famous, were all derived from the writings of the Arabians, or from the ſchools of the Saracens in *Spain* and *Africa* [*i*]. It was alſo from the ſchools and writings of the Arabian ſages, that the abſurd and puerile tricks of divination, and the cuſtom of foretelling future events from the poſition of the ſtars, the features of the face, and the lines of the hand, derived their origin. Theſe ridiculous practices, proceeding from ſo reſpectable a ſource, and moreover adapted to ſatisfy the idle curioſity of impatient mortals, were carried on in all the European nations; and in proceſs of time the pretended ſciences of aſtrology and divination acquired the higheſt reputation and authority.

The ſciences that were taught in theſe ſchools.

V. The *ſeven liberal arts*, as they were now ſtiled, were taught in the greateſt part of the ſchools that were erected in this century for the education of youth. The firſt ſtage of theſe ſciences was grammar, which was followed ſucceſ-

[*i*] MURATORI *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iii. p. 935.—GIANNONE, *Hiſt. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 151.—FREIND's *Hiſtory of Phyſic*.—It is well known, that the famous precepts of the ſchool of *Salernum*, for the preſervation of health, were compoſed in this century, at the requeſt of the king of *England*.

ſively

ſively by rhetoric and logic. When the diſciple, having learned theſe three branches, which were generally known by the name of *trivium*, extended his ambition farther, and was deſirous of new improvement in the ſciences, he was conducted ſlowly through the *quadrivium* [*k*] to the very ſummit of literary fame. But this method of teaching, which had been received in all the weſtern ſchools, was conſiderably changed towards the latter end of this century. For as the ſcience of *logic*, under which *metaphyſics* were in part comprehended, received new degrees of perfection from the deep meditations and the aſſiduous induſtry of certain acute thinkers, and was taught with more detail and ſubtilty than in former times, the greateſt part of the ſtudious youth became ſo enamoured of this branch of philoſophy, as to abandon grammar, rhetoric, and all the other liberal arts, that they might conſecrate their whole time to the diſcuſſion of logical queſtions, and the purſuit of metaphyſical ſpeculations. Nor was this ſurpriſing, when we conſider, that, according to the opinion which now prevailed in the republic of letters, a man who was well verſed in *dialectics*, i. e. in logical and metaphyſical knowledge, was reputed ſufficiently learned, and was ſuppoſed to ſtand in need of no other branches of erudition [*l*]. Hence that contempt

☞ [*k*] The *trivium* was a term invented in the times of barbariſm to expreſs the three ſciences that were firſt learned in the ſchools, *viz. Grammar*, *rhetoric*, and *logic*; and the ſchools, in which theſe ſciences alone were taught, were called *triviales*. The *quadrivium* comprehended the four mathematical ſciences, *viz. Arithmetic*, *muſic*, *geometry*, and *aſtronomy*.

[*l*] See BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 408, 409. 511, 512.—This is too likely to become the prevailing taſte even in our times: but it is an ancient taſte, as we may eaſily perceive by caſting an eye upon the literary hiſtory of the eleventh century. And to confirm ſtill farther the truth of that vulgar ſaying, that there is *nothing new under the ſun*, we ſhall quote

CENT. XI. PART II.

contempt of languages and eloquence, of the more elegant ſciences, and the finer arts, which ſpread its baneful influence through the Latin provinces; and hence that barbariſm and pedantic ſophiſtry that diſhonoured, in ſucceeding ages, the republic of letters, and corrupted, in a moſt hideous manner, the noble ſimplicity of true theology, and the pureſt ſyſtems of philoſophical wiſdom.

Dialectic or logic in high repute.

VI. The philoſophy of the Latins, in this century, was abſolutely confined within the circle of *dialectics*; while the other philoſophical ſciences were ſcarcely known by name [*m*]. This *dialectic*, indeed,

quote the following paſſage from the *Metalogicum* of JOHN of *Saliſbury*, a writer of no mean abilities. lib. i. cap. iii. p. 741. edit. *Lugdun. Bat.* 1639. *Poetæ, Hiſtoriographi, habebantur infames, et ſi quis incumbebat laboribus antiquorum, notabatur ut non modo aſello Arcadiæ tardior, ſed obtuſior plumbo vel lapide, omnibus erat in riſum.—Suis enim, aut magiſtri ſui, quiſquis incumbebat inventis.—Fiebant ergo ſummi repente philoſophi: nam qui illiteratus acceſſerat, fere non morabatur in ſcholis ulterius quam eo curriculo temporis, quo avium pulli plumeſcunt.—Sed quid docebant novi doctores et qui plus ſomniorum, quam vigiliarum in ſcrutinio philoſophiæ conſumſerant? Ecce nova fiebant omnia: innovabatur grammatica, immutabatur dialectica, contemnebatur rhetorica, et novas totius quadrivii vias, evacuatis priorum regulis, de ipſius philoſophiæ adytis proferebant. Solam* convenientiam, *ſive* rationem *loquebantur, argumentum ſonabat in ore omnium—ac ineptum nimis aut rude et a philoſopho alienum, impoſſibile credebatur* convenienter *et ad rationis normam quicquam dicere aut facere, niſi* convenientis *et* rationis *mentio expreſſim erat inſerta.* Many more paſſages of this nature are to be found in this author.

[*m*] We ſhall, indeed, find many, in the records of this century, honoured with the title of *Philoſophers*. Thus we hear of MANEGOLDUS the Philoſopher, ADALARDUS the Philoſopher, *&c.* But we muſt not attribute to the term *philoſopher*, when applied to theſe grammarians, the ſenſe which it bore among the ancient Greeks and Latins, and which it ſtill bears in our times. In the ſtile of, what we call, the middle age, every man of learning, of whatever kind his erudition might be, was called a *philoſopher*, and this title was alſo given to the interpreters of ſcripture, though that ſet of men were, generally ſpeaking, deſtitute of true philoſophy. See the

indeed, was miſerably dry and barren, as long as it was drawn from no other ſource than the *ten categories* falſely attributed to St. AUGUSTIN, or from the explications of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy compoſed by PORPHYRY and AVERROES. Theſe, however, were the only guides which the ſchools had to follow in the beginning of this century; nor had the public teachers either genius or courage enough to enlarge the ſyſtem, or to improve upon the principles of theſe dictators in philoſophy, whoſe authority was treated as infallible, and their productions, for a long time, regarded as perfect, to the great detriment of true ſcience. But, about the year 1050, the face of philoſophy began to change, and the ſcience of logic aſſumed a new aſpect. This revolution began in *France*, where ſeveral of the books of ARISTOTLE had been brought from the ſchools of the Saracens in *Spain*, and it was effected by a ſet of men highly renowned for their abilities and genius, ſuch as BERENGER, ROSCELLINUS, HILDEBERT, and after them by GILBERT DE LA PORRE, the famous ABELARD, and others. Theſe eminent logicians, though they followed the Stagirite as their guide, took nevertheleſs the liberty to illuſtrate and model anew his philoſophy, and to extend it far beyond its ancient limits.

VII. The philoſophers of this age, who were moſt famous for their zealous and ſucceſsful endeavours to improve the ſcience of logic, and accommodate it to general uſe, were LANFRANC, an Italian by birth, who was abbot of St. STEPHENS at *Caen* in *Normandy*, and was called from thence,

Chronicon Salernitanum in MURATORI *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. ii. part II. cap. cxxiv. p. 265. where we are told, that in the tenth century, in which the ſciences were almoſt totally extinguiſhed in *Italy*, *there were thirty-two philoſophers at Beneventa*. We learn, however, by what follows, that theſe philoſophers were partly grammarians, and partly perſons who were more or leſs verſed in certain liberal arts.

CENT. XI. PART II.

by WILLIAM the Conqueror, to the ſee of *Canterbury*, ANSELM his ſucceſſor, and ODO, whoſe laſt promotion was the biſhopric of *Cambray*. LANFRANC was ſo deeply verſed in this ſcience, that he was commonly called the *Dialectician*; and he employed with great dexterity the ſubtilties of logic in the controverſy which was carried on between him and the learned BERENGER, againſt whom he maintained the real preſence of CHRIST's body and blood in the holy ſacrament. ANSELM, in a very learned dialogue *De Grammatico*, throws much light upon the darkneſs and perplexity in which the ſcience of logic had lain ſo long involved; and, among other things, inveſtigates, with no ſmall ſagacity, the nature of *ſubſtance*, and *mode* or *quality*, in order to convey juſter notions of theſe metaphyſical entities than had been hitherto entertained [*n*]. This great prelate, who ſhone with a diſtinguiſhed luſtre in ſeveral branches of literature both ſacred and profane, was the firſt of the Latin doctors who diſpelled the clouds of ignorance and obſcurity that hung over the important ſciences of *metaphyſic* and *natural theology*, as appears from two books of his compoſition, wherein the truths concerning the Deity, which are deducible from the mere light of nature, are enumerated and explained with a degree of ſagacity which could not well be expected from a writer of this century. He was the inventor of that famous argument, vulgarly and erroneouſly attributed to DESCARTES, which demonſtrates the exiſtence of God from the idea of an infinitely perfect Being naturally implanted in the mind of man, and which is to be found, without exception, in the breaſt of every mortal. The ſolidity of this argument was, indeed, called

[*n*] This dialogue is to be found in the works of ANSELM, publiſhed by father GERBERON, tom. i. p. 143.

in

in queſtion, almoſt as ſoon as it was propoſed, by GAUNILO, a French monk, whoſe objections were anſwered by ANSELM, in a treatiſe profeſſedly written for that purpoſe [*o*]. ODO, the third reſtorer of logic whom we mentioned above, taught that ſcience with the greateſt applauſe, and illuſtrated it in three learned productions, which have not ſurvived the ruins of time [*p*].

VIII. The reſtoration of logic was immediately followed by a vehement diſpute between its reſtorers and patrons, concerning the *object* of that ſcience; ſuch was the term employed by the contending parties. This controverſy, which was long agitated in the ſchools, was in its nature ex-

Diſputes among the logicians. Nominaliſts and Realiſts.

[*o*] GAUNILO's Treatiſe is to be found in the works of ANSELM, with the anſwer of that learned prelate. ☞ As ANSELM makes ſuch a ſhining figure in the literary hiſtory of *England*, it will not be improper to add here a more ample account of his character and writings than that which is given by Dr. MOSHEIM. His life and manners were without reproach, though his ſpiritual ambition expoſed him juſtly to cenſure. His works are divided into three parts. The firſt contains his dogmatical tracts, and begins with a diſcourſe concerning the *Exiſtence of God*, the *Divine Attributes*, and the *Trinity*. This diſcourſe is called *Monologia*, becauſe it is drawn up in the form of a ſoliloquy. In this firſt part of the works of ANSELM, there are many curious reſearches upon ſubjects of a very difficult and myſterious nature, ſuch as the *Fall of Satan*, the *Reaſon why God created Man*, the doctrine of *Original Sin*, and the *Manner of its Communication to* ADAM's *Poſterity*, the *Liberty of the Will*, and the *Conſiſtency of Freedom with the Divine Preſcience*. The ſecond and third parts of the writings of this eminent prelate contain his practical and devotional performances, ſuch as *Homilies*, *Poems*, *Prayers*, &c. and his *Letters*, which are divided into four books.

[*p*] The titles of theſe three treatiſes, are as follows, *De Sophiſta*, *De Complexionibus*, *De Re et Ente*. The learned HERIMAN, in his *Narratio reſtaurationis Abbatiæ Sti. Martini Tornacenſis*, which is publiſhed in DACHERIUS's *Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter.* tom. ii. p. 889. ſpeaks of ODO in the following honourable manner: *Cum Odo ſeptem liberalium artium eſſet peritus, præcipue tamen in dialectica eminebat, et pro ipſa maxime clericorum frequentia eum expetebat.*

CENT. XI. PART II.

tremely trivial and unimportant; but, conſidered in its conſequences, it became a very ſerious and weighty affair; ſince the diſputants on both ſides made uſe of their reſpective opinions in explaining the doctrines of religion, and reciprocally loaded each other with the moſt odious invectives and the moſt opprobrious accuſations. In one point only they were unanimous, acknowledging that *logic* or *dialectic* had for its eſſential *object* the conſideration of *univerſals* in their various relations and points of compariſon, ſince *particular* and individual things, being liable to change, could not be the objects of a ſure and immutable ſcience. But the great queſtion was, whether theſe *univerſals*, which came within the ſphere of logical inquiries, belonged to the claſs of real *things*, or to that of mere *denominations?* One ſet of theſe ſubtile diſputants maintained that *univerſals* were undoubted *realities*, and ſupported their hypotheſis by the authority of PLATO, BOETIUS, and other ancient ſages; the other affirmed, that they were mere *words* and outward denominations, and pleaded in behalf of their cauſe the reſpectable ſuffrages of ARISTOTLE and PORPHYRY. The former were called Realiſts on account of their doctrine, and the latter Nominaliſts for the ſame reaſon. Each of the contending parties were, in proceſs of time, ſubdivided into various ſects, on account of the different ways in which many explained the doctrine that was the badge and characteriſtic of their ſect [*q*]. This controverſy made

[*q*] The learned BRUCKER, in his *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iii. p. 904. gives an ample account of the ſect of the Nominaliſts, and enlarges a good deal upon the nature and circumſtances of this logical conteſt; he alſo mentions the various writers, who have made this ſect and its doctrine the object of their reſearches. Among theſe writers, the principal was JOHN SALABERT, preſbyter in the dioceſe of *Agen*, who publiſhed at *Paris*, in the year 1651, in 8vo, a treatiſe, entitled

made a prodigious noiſe in all the ſchools throughout *Europe* during many ſucceeding ages, and produced often unhappy contentions and animoſities between philoſophers and divines. Some are of opinion, that it derived its origin from the diſputes that were carried on between BERENGER and his adverſaries, concerning the euchariſt [*r*]; a notion which, though it be advanced without authority, is yet by no means deſtitute of probability, ſince the hypotheſis of the Nominaliſts might be very ſucceſsfully employed in defending the doctrine of BERENGER, concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper.

IX. The ſect of the Nominaliſts had for their chief a certain perſon called JOHN, who, on account of his logical ſubtilty, was ſurnamed the *Sophiſt*, which is the only circumſtance we know of his hiſtory [*s*]. His principal diſciples were ROBERT

titled *Philoſophia Nominalium Vindicata*. This book, which is extremely rare, has been ſeen by none of the authors who have written profeſſedly concerning the ſect of the Nominaliſts. A copy of it, taken from the manuſcript in the French king's library, was communicated to me, from which it appears, that SALABERT, who was certainly a very acute and ingenious logician, employed his labour rather in defending the doctrine of the Nominaliſts than in giving an accurate account of their ſect. There are, however, ſeveral things to be found in his book, which are far from being generally known, even among the learned.

[*r*] DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 443.—GERH. DU BOIS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 770.

[*s*] This account we have from the unknown author of the *Fragmentum Hiſtoriæ Francicæ à Roberto rege ad mortem Philippi* I., which is publiſhed in DU CHESNE's *Scriptores Hiſtoriæ Francicæ*, tom. iv. p. 90. whoſe words are as follows: *In Dialectica hi potentes extiterunt Sophiſtæ, Johannes, qui artem Sophiſticam vocalem eſſe diſſeruit*, &c.—DU BOULAY (*Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 443. et 612.) conjectures that this JOHN the Sophiſt was the ſame perſon with JOHN of *Chartres*, ſurnamed the *Deaf*, who was firſt phyſician to HENRY I., king of *France*, and had acquired a high degree of renown by his genius and erudition. The ſame author (p. 377.) tells us, that

CENT. XI. PART II.

ROBERT of *Paris*, ROSCELIN of *Compiegne*, and ARNOUL of *Laon*, who propagated his doctrine with induſtry and ſucceſs, to whom we may add, with ſome probability, RAIMBERT, the maſter of a famous ſchool at *Liſle* in *Flanders*, who is ſaid, according to the quibbling humour of the times, to *have read* NOMINAL *logic to his diſciples, while* ODO, whom we have already had occaſion to mention, *inſtructed his ſcholars in* REALITY [*t*]. The moſt renowned of all the *nominal* philoſophers of this age was ROSCELIN; and hence it is that many have conſidered him as the chief and founder of that ſect, and that he is ſtill conſidered as ſuch by ſeveral learned men.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the Church, and its form of government during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. ALL the records of this century loudly complain of the vices that reigned among the rulers of the church, and, in general, among all the ſacerdotal orders; they alſo deplore that univerſal decay of piety and diſcipline, that was the conſequence of this corruption in a ſet of men, who were bound to ſupport, by their example,

JOHN had for his maſter GIRALDUS of *Orleans*, who was an incomparable poet, and an excellent rhetorician, but he advances this without any proof. MABILLON, on the other hand, in his *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. lib. lxvii. § lxxviii. p. 261. ſuppoſes, that JOHN the Nominaliſt was the ſame perſon who made known to ANSELM the error of ROSCELINUS concerning the three Perſons in the Godhead.

[*t*] The paſſage in the original is: *Qui dialecticam clericis ſuis in* VOCE *legebat, quum* ODO *in* RE *diſcipulis legeret.* See HERIMANNUS, *Hiſtor. reſtaurationis Monaſterii Sti. Martini Tornacenſ.* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 889.

their

their authority, and their inſtructions, the ſacred intereſts of religion and virtue. The weſtern biſhops were no ſooner elevated to the rank of dukes, counts, and nobles, and enriched with ample territories, than they gave themſelves up entirely to the dominion of pleaſure and ambition, and, wholly employed in diſplaying the magnificence of their temporal ſtations, frequented the courts of princes, accompanied always with a ſplendid train of attendants and domeſtics [*u*]. The inferior orders of the clergy were alſo licentious in their own way; few among them preſerved any remains of piety and virtue, we might add, of decency and diſcretion. While their rulers were wallowing in luxury, and baſking in the beams of worldly pomp and ſplendor, they were indulging themſelves, without the leaſt ſenſe of ſhame, in fraudulent practices, an impure and laſcivious gratifications, and even in the commiſſion of the moſt flagitious crimes. The Grecian clergy were ſomewhat leſs chargeable with theſe ſhocking irregularities, as the calamities under which their country groaned, impoſed a reſtraint upon their paſſions, and gave a check to their licentiouſneſs. Yet, notwithſtanding theſe ſalutary reſtraints, there were few examples of piety and virtue to be found among them.

CENT. XI. PART II.

II. The authority and luſtre of the Latin church, or, to ſpeak more properly, the power and dominion of the Roman pontifs, aroſe in this century to their higheſt period, though they aroſe by degrees, and had much oppoſition and many difficulties to conquer. In the preceding age the

The authority of the Roman pontifs.

[*u*] See among other examples of this epiſcopal grandeur, that of ADALBERT, in ADAM. *Bremenſ.* lib. iii. cap. xxiii. p. 38. lib. iv. cap. xxxv. p. 52. that of GUNTHER, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of CANISIUS, tom. iii. part I. p. 185. and that of MANASSES, in the *Muſeum Italicum* of MABILLON, tom. i. p. 114. Add to all theſe MURATORII *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 72.

CENT. XI. PART II.

pontifs had acquired a great degree of authority in religious matters, and in every thing that related to the government of the church; and their credit and influence increaſed prodigiouſly towards the commencement of this century. For then they received the pompous titles of *maſters of the world*, and *popes*, i. e. *univerſal fathers*; they preſided alſo every where in the councils by their legates; aſſumed the authority of ſupreme arbiters in all controverſies that aroſe concerning religion or church diſcipline; and maintained the pretended rights of the church againſt the encroachments and uſurpations of kings and princes. Their authority, however, was confined within certain limits; for, on the one hand, it was reſtrained by ſovereign princes, that it might not arrogantly aim at civil dominion; and on the other, it was oppoſed by the biſhops themſelves, that it might not ariſe to a ſpiritual deſpotiſm, and utterly deſtroy the liberty and privileges of ſynods and councils [*w*]. From the time of LEO IX., the popes employed every method, which the moſt artful ambition could ſuggeſt, to remove theſe limits, and to render their dominion both deſpotic and univerſal. They not only aſpired to the character of ſupreme legiſlators in the church, to an unlimited juriſdiction over all ſynods and councils whether general or provincial, to the ſole diſtribution of all eccleſiaſtical honours and benefices as divinely authoriſed and appointed for that purpoſe, but they carried their inſolent pretenſions ſo far as to give themſelves out for

[*w*] The very learned LAUNOY (in his *Aſſertio contra Privilegium Sti. Medardi*, part II. cap. xxxi. opp. tom. iii. part II. p. 307,) has given us an accurate account of the eccleſiaſtical laws, and of the power of the hierarchy, during this century, which he collected from the letters of pope GREGORY VII.; from which account it appears, that GREGORY, ambitious as he was, did not pretend to a ſupreme and deſpotic authority in the church.

lords of the univerſe, arbiters of the fate of kingdoms and empires, and ſupreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before LEO IX., no pope was ſo enormouſly impudent as to claim this unbounded authority, or to aſſume the power of transferring territories and provinces from their lawful poſſeſſors to new maſters. This pontif gave the example of ſuch an amazing pretenſion to his *holy* ſucceſſors, by granting to the Normans, who had ſettled in *Italy*, the lands and territories which they had already uſurped, or were employed in forcing out of the hands of the Greeks and Saracens [*x*]. The ambition, however, of the aſpiring popes was oppoſed by the emperors, the kings of *France*, by WILLIAM the Conqueror, who was now ſeated on the throne of *England*, and was the boldeſt aſſertor of the rights and privileges of royalty againſt the high claims of the apoſtolic ſee [*y*], and alſo by ſeveral other princes. Nor

[*x*] See GAUFR. MALLATERRA *Hiſt. Sicula*, lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 553. tom. v. *Scriptor. Ital.* MURATORII. ☞ The tranſlator has here incorporated the note [*s*] of the original into the text.

[*y*] See EADMERI *Hiſtoria novorum*, lib. i. p. 29. which is publiſhed at the end of the works of ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. It is proper to obſerve here, that if it is true on the one hand, that WILLIAM the Conqueror oppoſed, on many occaſions, with the utmoſt vehemence and zeal the growing power of the Roman pontifs, and of the aſpiring biſhops; it is no leſs certain, on the other, that, to accompliſh his ambitious views, he, like many other European princes, had recourſe to the influence of the pontifs upon the minds of the multitude, and thereby nouriſhed and encouraged the pride and ambition of the court of *Rome*. For while he was preparing all things for his expedition into *England*, he ſent ambaſſadors to Pope ALEXANDER II., *in order* (as MATTHEW PARIS ſays, *Hiſt Major*. lib. i. p. 2.) *to have his undertaking approved and juſtified by apoſtolical authority; and the pope, having conſidered the claims of the contending parties, ſent a* STANDARD *to* WILLIAM *as the omen of his approaching royalty*. It is highly probable, that the Normans in *Italy* had made the ſame humble requeſt to LEO IX., and demanded his confirmation both of the

Nor did the biſhops, particularly thoſe of *France* and *Germany*, ſit tamely ſilent under the papal yoke; many of them endeavoured to maintain their rights and the privileges of the church; but as many, ſeduced by the allurements of intereſt or the dictates of ſuperſtition, ſacrificed their liberties, and yielded to the pontifs. Hence it happened, that theſe imperious lords of the church, though they did not entirely gain their point, nor ſatisfy to the full their raging ambition, yet obtained vaſt augmentations of power, and extended their authority from day to day.

III. The ſee of *Rome*, after the death of SYLVESTER II., which happened in the year 1003, was filled ſucceſſively by JOHN XVII., JOHN XVIII., and SERGIUS IV., none of whoſe pontificates were diſtinguiſhed by any memorable events; it is, however, proper to obſerve, that theſe three popes were confirmed in the ſee of *Rome* by the approbation and authority of the emperors, under whoſe reign they were elected to that high dignity. BENEDICT VIII., who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1012, being obliged by his competitor GREGORY to leave *Rome*, fled into *Germany* for ſuccour, and threw himſelf at the feet of HENRY II., by whom he was reinſtated in the Apoſtolic chair, which he poſſeſſed in peace until the year 1024. It was during his pontificate, that thoſe famous Normans, who make ſuch a ſhining figure in hiſtory, came into *Italy*, and reduced ſeveral of its richeſt provinces under their dominion. BENEDICT was ſucceeded by his brother JOHN XIX., who ruled the church until the year 1033. The five pontifs

the poſſeſſions they had acquired, and of thoſe they deſigned to uſurp. And when we conſider all this, it will not appear ſo ſurpriſing that the popes aimed at univerſal empire, ſince they were encouraged to this by the mean ſubmiſſions and ſervile homage of the European princes.

we have now been mentioning were not chargeable with diſhonouring their high ſtation by that licentiouſneſs and immorality that rendered ſo many of their ſucceſſors infamous; their lives were virtuous; at leaſt, their conduct was decent. But their examples had little effect upon BENEDICT IX., a moſt abandoned profligate, and a wretch capable of the moſt horrid crimes, whoſe flagitious conduct drew upon him the juſt reſentment of the Romans, who, in the year 1038, degraded him from his office. He was afterwards indeed reſtored, by the emperor CONRAD, to the papal chair; but, inſtead of learning circumſpection and prudence from his former diſgrace, he grew ſtill more ſcandalous in his life and manners, and ſo provoked the Roman people by his repeated crimes, that they depoſed him a ſecond time A. D. 1044, and elected in his place JOHN biſhop of *Sabina*, who aſſumed the name of SYLVESTER III. About three months after this new revolution, the relations and adherents of BENEDICT roſe up in arms, drove SYLVESTER out of the city, and reſtored the degraded pontif to his forfeited honours, which, however, he did not enjoy long; for, perceiving that there was no poſſibility of appeaſing the reſentment of the Romans, he ſold the pontificate to JOHN GRATIAN, arch-preſbyter of *Rome*, who took the name of GREGORY VI. Thus the church had, at the ſame time, two chiefs, SYLVESTER and GREGORY, whoſe rivality was the occaſion of much trouble and confuſion. This conteſt was terminated in the year 1046, in the council held at *Sutri* by the emperor HENRY III., who ſo ordered matters, that BENEDICT, GREGORY, and SYLVESTER were declared unworthy of the pontificate, and SUIDGER, biſhop of *Bamberg*, was raiſed to that dignity,

CENT. XI. PART II.

nity, which he enjoyed for a ſhort time under the title of CLEMENT II. [z].

IV. After the death of CLEMENT II., which happened in the year 1047, BENEDICT IX., though twice degraded, aimed anew at the papal dignity, and accordingly forced himſelf into St. PETER's chair for the third time. But the year following he was obliged to ſurrender the pontificate to POPPO, biſhop of *Brixen*, known by the name of DAMASUS II., whom HENRY II. elected pope in *Germany*, and ſent from thence into *Italy* to take poſſeſſion of that dignity. Upon the death of DAMASUS, who ruled the ſee of *Rome* but three and twenty days, the ſame emperor, in the diet held at *Worms* A. D. 1048, appointed BRUNO, biſhop of *Toul*, to ſucceed him in the pontificate. This prelate is known in the liſt of the popes by the name of LEO IX.; and his private virtues, as well as his public acts of zeal and piety in the government of the church, were deemed meritorious enough to entitle him to a place among the ſaintly order. But if we deduce from theſe pretended virtues his vehement zeal for augmenting the opulence and authority of the church of *Rome*, and his laudable ſeverity in correcting and puniſhing certain enormous vices [a], which were common among the clergy during his

[z] In this compendious account of the popes, I have followed the relations of FRANCIS and ANTHONY PAGI, PAPEBROCK, and alſo thoſe of MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiæ*, perſuaded that the learned and judicious reader will juſtify my treating with the utmoſt contempt, what BARONIUS and others have alleged in favour of GREGORY VI.

☞ [a] In ſeveral councils which he aſſembled in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, he propoſed rigorous laws againſt ſimony, ſodomy, inceſtuous and adulterous marriages; the cuſtom of carrying arms that was grown univerſal among the clergy; the apoſtaſy of the monks, who abandoned their habit and renounced their profeſſion, &c.

pontificate,

pontificate, there will remain little in the life and adminiſtration of this pontif, that could give him any pretenſion to ſuch a diſtinction. It is, at leaſt, certain, that many, who induſtriouſly conceal or excuſe the numerous infirmities and failings of the pontifs, cenſure, with the utmoſt freedom, the temerity and injuſtice of the meaſures he took towards the concluſion of his days. Such, among others, was the war which he inconſiderately entered into, in the year 1053, with the Normans, whoſe neighbourhood he did not like, and whom he was grieved to ſee in the poſſeſſion of *Apulia*. His temerity, indeed, was ſeverely puniſhed by the iſſue of this war, from which he derived the bittereſt fruits, being taken priſoner by the enemy, and led captive to *Benevento*. Here diſmal reflexions upon his unhappy fate preyed upon his ſpirits, and threw him into a dangerous fit of ſickneſs; ſo that after a year's impriſonment he was ſent to *Rome*, where he concluded his days on the 19th of *April*, A. D. 1054 [*b*].

V. After the death of LEO the papal chair was filled, in the year 1055, by GEBHARD, biſhop of *Eichſtadt*, who aſſumed the name of VICTOR II., and after governing the church about three years, was ſucceeded by STEPHEN IX., brother to GODFREY, duke of *Lorrain*, who died a few months after his election. Nothing memorable happened under the adminiſtration of theſe two pontifs. GERRARD, biſhop of *Florence*, who obtained the papacy A. D. 1058, and took the name of NICOLAS II., makes a greater figure in hiſtory than ſeveral of his predeceſſors [*c*]. We paſs in ſilence

[*b*] See the *Acta Sanctorum ad d.* xix *Aprilis*, tom. iii. p. 642.—*Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 459.—GIANNONE *Hiſt. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 52.

[*c*] Beſides the accounts given of NICOLAS II., by the writers of the papal hiſtory, there is a particular and accurate hiſtory of this pontif drawn up by the Benedictine monks, in the *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 515.

JOHN,

JOHN, biſhop of *Velétri*, who uſurped the pontificate, as alſo the title of BENEDICT X., after the death of STEPHEN, and who was depoſed with ignominy, after having poſſeſſed about nine months the dignity, to which he had no other title, than what he derived from lawleſs violence. NICOLAS, upon the removal of this uſurper, aſſembled a council at *Rome* A. D. 1059, in which, among many ſalutary laws deſigned to heal the inveterate diſorders that had afflicted the church, one remarkable decree was paſſed for changing the ancient form of electing the Roman pontif; this alteration was deſigned to prevent the tumults and commotions which aroſe in *Rome*, and the factions which divided *Italy*, when a new pope was to be elected. The ſame pontif received the homage of the Normans, and ſolemnly created ROBERT GUISCARD duke of *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and *Sicily*, on condition that he ſhould obſerve, as a faithful vaſſal, an inviolable allegiance to the Roman church, and pay an annual tribute in acknowledgment of his ſubjection to the apoſtolic ſee. By what authority NICOLAS confirmed the Norman prince in the poſſeſſion of theſe provinces, is more than we know; certain it is, that he had no ſort of property in the lands which he granted ſo liberally to the Normans, who held them already by the odious right of conqueſt [*d*]. Perhaps the lordly pontif founded this right of ceſſion upon the fictitious donation of CONSTANTINE, which has been already taken notice of in the courſe of this hiſtory; or, probably, ſeduced by the artful and ambitious ſuggeſtions of HILDEBRAND, who had himſelf an eye upon the pontificate, and afterwards filled it, in effect, under the adopted name of GREGORY VII., he imagined

[*d*] See MURATORI *Annali d'Italia*, tom. vi. p. 186.—BARONIUS *Annal. ad A.* 1060.

that

that, as CHRIST's vicegerent, the Roman pontif was the king of kings, and had the whole univerſe for his domain. It is well known that HILDEBRAND had a ſupreme aſcendant in the counſels of NICOLAS, and that the latter neither undertook nor executed any thing without his direction. Be that as it may, it was the feudal grant made to GUISCARD by this pope, that laid the foundation of the kingdom of *Naples*, or of the two *Sicilies*, and of the ſovereignty over that kingdom which the Roman pontifs conſtantly claim, and which the Sicilian monarchs annually acknowledge.

The privileges of the cardinals in the election of the pope.

VI. Before the pontificate of NICOLAS II., the popes were choſen not only by the ſuffrages of the *cardinals*, but alſo by thoſe of the whole Roman clergy, the nobility, the burgeſſes, and the aſſembly of the people. An election, in which ſuch a confuſed and jarring multitude was concerned, could not but produce continual factions, animoſities, and tumults. To prevent theſe, as far as was poſſible, this artful and provident pontif had a law paſſed by which the *cardinals*, as well preſbyters as biſhops, were empowered, upon a vacancy in the ſee of *Rome*, to elect a new pope, without any prejudice to the ancient privileges of the Roman emperors in this important matter [*e*]. Nor were the reſt of the clergy, with the burgeſſes

☞ [*e*] It does not appear, that NICOLAS was at all ſolicitous about the privileges of the emperor, and his authority in the election of the biſhop of *Rome*; for the words of the decree in all the various copies of it are to this import: "The "cardinals ſhall firſt deliberate concerning the election of a "pontif, and the conſent of the other clergy and of the peo-"ple ſhall be required to confirm their choice. The pope "ſhall be choſen out of the members that compoſe the church "of *Rome*, if a proper perſon can be found among them; if "not, he ſhall be elected elſewhere. *All this without any* "*prejudice to the honour of our dear ſon* HENRY *(who is now* "*king and ſhall be ſoon emperor, as we have already promiſed* "*him)*

burgeſſes and people, excluded from all part in this election, ſince their conſent was ſolemnly demanded, and alſo eſteemed of much weight [*f*]. In conſequence, however, of this new regulation, the *Cardinals* acted the principal part in the creation of the new pontif; though they ſuffered for

" *him) or to the honour of his ſucceſſors on whom the apoſtolic ſee* " *ſhall confer perſonally and ſucceſſively the ſame high privi-* " *lege.*" Here we ſee the good pontif taking manifeſtly advantage of the minority of HENRY IV., to depreciate and diminiſh the ancient prerogatives of the imperial crown, and to magnify the authority of the papal mitre; for he declares as a *perſonal right* granted by the Roman ſee to each emperor for himſelf, the privilege of confirming the pope's election; whereas it is well known that that privilege had been veſted in the emperors of *Germany* during many preceding ages. See FLEURY, *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* vol. xiii. livre lx. p. 64, 65. *Bruſſels* edition.—It is proper to obſerve here, that the cringing and ignoble ſubmiſſion of CHARLES the Bald, who would not accept of the title of emperor before it was conferred upon him by the Roman pontif, occaſioned, in proceſs of time, that abſurd notion that the papal conſecration was requiſite in order to qualify the kings of *Germany* to aſſume the title of Roman emperors, though, without that conſecration, theſe kings had all *Italy* under their dominion, and exerciſed in every part of it various rights and prerogatives of ſovereignty. Hence the kings of *Germany* were firſt ſtyled kings of the Franks and Lombards, afterwards kings of the Romans until the year 1508; when MAXIMILIAN I. changed the title of *king* into that of *emperor*.

[*f*] The decree of NICOLAS concerning the election of the Roman pontif is to be found in many authors, and particularly in the *Concilia*. But upon comparing together ſeveral copies of this famous decree, I found them in many reſpects very different from each other. In ſome copies the decree appears abridged; in others, it is long and prolix. In ſome it ſeems favourable to the rights and privileges of the Roman emperors; in others, it appears to have the contrary tendency. The moſt ample copy is that which we find in the *Chronicon Farfenſe* in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. ii. part II. p. 645, which differs however, in various circumſtances, from that which is publiſhed by HUGO FLORIACENSIS, in his book *De regia poteſtate et ſacerdotali dignitate*, in BALUZII *Miſcellaneis*, tom. iv. p. 62. Notwithſtanding the diverſity that there is in the copies of this famous decree, they all agree in confirming the accounts we have given of the plans and pontificate of NICOLAS.

a long

a long time much oppoſition both from the ſacerdotal orders and the Roman citizens, who were conſtantly either reclaiming their ancient rights, or abuſing the privilege they yet retained of confirming the election of every new pope by their approbation and conſent. In the following century there was an end put to all theſe diſputes by ALEXANDER III., who was ſo lucky as to finiſh and complete what NICOLAS had only begun, and who transferred and confined to the college of *cardinals* the right of electing to the apoſtolic ſee, excluding the nobility, the people, and the reſt of the clergy, from all concern in this important matter [*g*].

It may not be improper here to give ſome account of the origin of the *cardinals* [*h*], and the nature of their privileges and functions. Many writers [*i*] have treated this ſubject in an ample manner, and have ſhed upon it a profuſion of erudition, which deſerves, no doubt, the higheſt applauſe; but they are, generally ſpeaking, defective in perſpicuity and preciſion; nor do I know of any, who have confined themſelves to the true ſtate of the queſtion, and inveſtigated, in a ſatiſ-

[*g*] See MABILLON, *Comm. in Ord. Roman.* tom. ii. *Muſei Italici*, p. 114.—CONSTANT. CENNI *Præf. ad Concilium Lateran. Stephani* iii. p. 18. *Rom.* 1735, in 4to.—FRANC. PAGI *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 374.

☞ [*h*] The tranſlator has here incorporated into the text the long and important note [*e*] of the original concerning the *cardinals*. The citations and references only are thrown into the notes.

[*i*] The authors who have written concerning the name, origin, and rights of the *cardinals*, are enumerated by Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* p. 455, 456.—CASP. SAGITTARIUS *Introd. ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſt.* cap. xxix. p. 771. et Jo. AND. SCHMIDIUS *in Supplement.* p. 644.—CHRIST. GRYPHIUS *Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Sæculi* xvii. p. 430. add to theſe LUDOV. THOMASSINI *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ vetus et nova*, tom. i. lib. ii. cap. 115, 116. p. 616. & LUD. ANT. MURATORI, whoſe learned diſſertation *De Origine Cardinalatus* is publiſhed in his *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 156.

CENT. XI. PART II.

factory manner, the true origin of the office of cardinal, and the reaſons that occaſioned the inſtitution of that order of eccleſiaſtics. Several learned men have employed much time and labour in fixing the ſenſe of the word *cardinal*, and in illuſtrating its meaning from ancient monuments and records; but, however worthy of a curious philologiſt theſe reſearches may be, yet they contribute little or nothing to clear up the point in queſtion, or to convey an accurate and ſatisfactory notion of the true origin of the college of cardinals, and the nature of that eccleſiaſtical dignity. It is certain, that the word *cardinal*, when applied to perſons or things, or more eſpecially to the ſacred order, was, according to the language of the middle age, a term of dubious ſignification, and was ſuſceptible of various ſenſes. It is alſo well known, that in former times this title was, by no means, peculiar to the prieſts and miniſters of the church of *Rome*, but was in uſe in all the Latin churches, and that not only the *ſecular* clergy, but alſo the *regular*, ſuch as abbots, canons, and monks, were capable of this denomination, and were ſtiled *cardinals*, though in different ſenſes. But after the pontificate of ALEXANDER III., the common uſe of the term *cardinal* was gradually diminiſhed, and it was confined to ſuch only as were immediately concerned in the election of the pope, and who had the right of ſuffrage in this weighty matter. So that when we inquire into the origin of the college of *cardinals* at *Rome*, the queſtion is not, who they were, that in the remoter periods of the church were diſtinguiſhed, among the Latins in general, or at *Rome* in particular, from the reſt of the clergy, by the name of *cardinals*; nor do we inquire into the proper ſignification of that term, or into the various ſenſes in which it was formerly employed; the true ſtate of the queſtion is this: Who the perſons

ſons were that NICOLAS II. comprehended under the denomination of *cardinals*, when he veſted in the Roman *cardinals* alone the right of electing the new pontif, and excluded from that important privilege the reſt of the clergy, the nobility, the burgeſſes, and the people? When this is known with certainty, then we ſhall have a juſt notion of the *college of cardinals* in its firſt riſe, and ſhall alſo perceive the difference there is between the firſt *cardinals*, and thoſe of our times. Now this may eaſily be learned from the edict of NICOLAS II. which ſets the matter in the cleareſt light. *We have thought proper to enact*, ſays the pontif, *that, upon the deceaſe of the biſhop of the Roman catholic or univerſal church, the affair of the election be treated principally and previouſly to all other deliberations, among the* CARDINAL BISHOPS *alone, who ſhall afterwards call in to their council the* CARDINAL CLERKS, *and require finally the conſent of the reſt of the clergy and the people to their election* [*k*]. Here we ſee, that the pontif divides into two claſſes the *cardinals* who were to have the right of ſuffrage in the election of his ſucceſſors, one of which he calls *cardinal biſhops*, and the other *cardinal clerks*. By the former we are manifeſtly to underſtand the ſeven biſhops, who belonged to the city and territory of *Rome*, whom NICOLAS calls, in the ſame edict, *comprovinciales epiſcopi* (an epithet which had been uſed before by LEO I.) and who had been diſtinguiſhed by the title of *cardinal biſhops* long before the preſent century. The words of NICOLAS confirm this account of the matter, and place it beyond all poſſibility of contradiction;

☞ [*k*] The paſſage of the edict (which we have here tranſlated from HUGO FLORIACUS in BALUZII *Miſcell.* tom. iv. p. 62) runs thus in the original: *Conſtituimus ut, obeunte hujus Romanæ univerſales Eccleſiæ Pontifice, imprimis,* CARDINALES EPISCOPI *diligentiſſima ſimul conſideratione tractantes, mox ſibi* CLERICOS CARDINALES *adhibeant, ſicque reliquus Clerus et Populus ad conſenſum novæ electionis accedant.*

for he declares, that by *cardinal biſhops* he underſtands thoſe to whom it belonged to conſecrate the pontif elect; *ſince the apoſtolic ſee*, obſerves the papal legiſlator, *cannot be under the juriſdiction of any ſuperior or metropolitan* [*l*], *the* CARDINAL BISHOPS *muſt neceſſarily ſupply the place of a metropolitan, and fix the elected pontif on the ſummit of apoſtolic exaltation and empire* [*m*]. Now it is well known, that the ſeven biſhops of *Rome*, above mentioned, had the privilege of conſecrating the Roman pontif.

All theſe things being duly conſidered, we ſhall immediately perceive the true nature and meaning of the famous edict, according to which it is manifeſt, that, upon the death of a pontif, the CARDINAL BISHOPS were firſt to deliberate *alone* concerning a proper ſucceſſor, and to examine the reſpective merit of the candidates that might pretend to this high dignity, and afterwards to call in the CARDINAL CLERKS, not only to demand their counſel, but alſo to join with them in the election. The word *clerk* here bears the ſame ſenſe with that of *preſbyter*, and it is undeniably certain, that the name of *cardinal preſbyters* was given to the miniſters of the eight and twenty Roman *pariſhes*, or principal churches. All the reſt of the clergy, of whatever order or rank they might be, were, together with the people, expreſsly excluded from the right of voting in the election of the pontif, though they were allowed what is called a *negative* ſuffrage, and their conſent was required to what the others had done. From all which it appears,

☞ [*l*] In the conſecration of a new biſhop in any province the metropolitan always bore the principal part; as therefore there was no metropolitan to inſtal the pope, CARDINAL BISHOPS performed that ceremony.

[*m*] Such are the ſwelling and bombaſtic terms of the edict: *Quia ſedes apoſtolica ſuper ſe metropolitanum habere non poteſt; cardinales epiſcopi metropolitani vice procul dubio ſungantur, qui electum antiſtitem ad apoſtolici culminis apicem provehant.*

that

that the college of electors, who chose the Roman pontif, and who after this period were called *cardinals* in a new and unusual acceptation of that term, consisted, according to their original establishment, by NICOLAS II., of only two orders, namely, *cardinal bishops* and *cardinal clerks*, or presbyters [*n*].

It is necessary to observe, before we finish this digression, that the famous decree of NICOLAS could not obtain the force of a law. "It is evi- "dent, *says* ANSELM, *bishop of Lucca* [*o*], that the "edict of NICOLAS is, and always has been, "without the smallest degree of weight or autho- "rity. But in affirming this, I have not the "least design to cast any reflection upon the bless- "ed memory of that pontif, or to derogate from "the applause that is due to his virtues. . . . . "As a man, however, he was fallible, and, "through the weakness that is inseparable from "humanity, was liable to be seduced into mea- "sures that were inconsistent with equity

[*n*] We must therefore take care that we be not misled by the error of ONUPHR. PANVINIUS, who affirms, * that the *cardinal bishops* were not added to the college of cardinals before the pontificate of ALEXANDER III. Nor are we to listen to the supposition of those writers, who imagine that certain *deacons* were, from the beginning, members of that college of *cardinals*, by whom the popes were elected. There were, indeed, in the Roman church long before the edict of NICOLAS, and there still remain, *cardinal deacons*, i. e. superintendants of those churches which have hospitals annexed to them, and whose revenues are appropriated to the support of the poor; but they were evidently excluded from the election of the pope, which, by the edict of NICOLAS, was to be made by the *cardinal bishops and clerks* alone. Hence we find the *cardinals* plainly distinguished from the deacons in the diploma that was drawn up for the election of GREGORY VII. to the pontificate.

[*o*] ANSELMI *Luccensis*, lib. ii. *contra* WIBERTUM, *Antipapam, et sequaces ejus, in* CANISII *Lectionib. Antiquis*, tom. iii. par. I. p. 383.

* See MABILLON, *Comment. in Ordinem Rom.* p. 115. tom. ii. *Musei Italici.*

CENT. XI. PART II.

"and juſtice." It is true, the prelate has here principally in view that part of the edict in which NICOLAS acknowledges and confirms the right of the emperors to ratify the election of the Roman pontif; yet what he ſays is undoubtedly true of the whole edict in all its parts. For the ſeven *Palatine judges* [*p*], who were excluded by this decree from the important privilege they had formerly enjoyed of voting in the election to the apoſtolic ſee, complained loudly of the injury that was done them, and, ſeconded in their complaints by the various orders of the clergy, and by the clamours of the army, the citizens, and the multitude, they declared their oppoſition to the execution of this edict, and gave much trouble and uneaſineſs to the *cardinals* who had been conſtituted electors by NICOLAS. To appeaſe theſe tumults, ALEXANDER III. augmented the college of the electing *cardinals*, by conferring that dignity upon the prior, or arch-preſbyter, of *St. John Lateran*, the arch-preſbyters of *St. Peter*'s and *St. Mary Maggiore*, the abbots of *St. Paul*'s and *St. Laurence without the wall*, and, laſtly, upon the ſeven *Palatine judges* [*q*]. By this dexterous ſtratagem the higher order of the clergy was defeated, and ceaſed to oppoſe the meaſures of the *cardinal* electors; nor, indeed, could their oppoſition be of any ſignificancy, ſince their chiefs and leaders were become members of the ſacred college inſtituted by NICOLAS. The *inferior clergy* continued yet obſtinate; but their oppoſition was vanquiſhed in the ſame manner, and they were reduced to ſilence by the promotion of

[*p*] Theſe judges were the *Primicerius*, *Secundicerius*, *Arcarius*, *Saccellarius*, *Protoſcriniarius*, *Primicerius Defenſorum*, *et Adminiculator*; for a particular account of whoſe reſpective offices, ſervices, and privileges, ſee GRÆVII *Theſaurus Antiquit.* DU CANGE, &c.

[*q*] CENNI *Præf. ad Concil. Lateran. Stephan.* iii. p. 19.—MABILLON, *Comment. ad Ord. Roman.* p. 115. *ex Panvinio.*

their

their chiefs, the *cardinal deacons*, to the dignity of electors. Who it was, whether ALEXANDER III., or ſome other pontif, that raiſed the principal Roman deacons to the rank of *cardinals*, is not certain; but nothing is more evident than that the deſign of this promotion was to put an end to the murmurs and complaints of the inferior clergy, who reſented highly the violation of their privileges. CENT. XI. PART II.

When the various orders of the clergy were drawn off from the oppoſition, it was no difficult matter to ſilence the people, and to exclude them from all part in the election of the pontif. And accordingly, when, upon the death of ALEXANDER III., it was propoſed to chuſe LUCIUS III. [*r*] as his ſucceſſor, the conſent and approbation of the clergy and people, which had hitherto been always eſteemed neceſſary to ratify the election, were not ſo much as demanded, and the affair was tranſacted by the college of *cardinals* alone, who have continued to maintain that excluſive and important privilege even to our times. Some writers affirm, that INNOCENT II. had been elected in the ſame manner, by the *cardinals* alone, without the conſent of the clergy or the people, ſeveral years before the pontificate of LUCIUS [*s*]; this may be true, but it is nothing to the purpoſe; for as the election of INNOCENT II. was irregular, it cannot be alleged in the caſe before us.

VII. From what has been obſerved in the preceding ſection we may conclude, that the college of *cardinals*, and the extenſive authority and important privileges they enjoy at this day, derive their origin from the edict publiſhed at the requeſt and under the pontificate of NICOLAS II.;

☞ [*r*] In the original, inſtead of LUCIUS III., we read VICTOR III., which was certainly a miſtake of inadvertency in the learned author.

[*s*] See PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 615.

that, under the title of *cardinals*, this pontif comprehended the ſeven Roman biſhops, who were conſidered as his *ſuffragans*, and of whom the biſhop of *Oſtia* was the chief, as alſo the eight and twenty miniſters, who had inſpection over the principal Roman churches; and that to theſe were added, in proceſs of time, under ALEXANDER III. and other pontifs, new members, in order to appeaſe the reſentment of thoſe who looked upon themſelves as injured by the edict of NICOLAS, and alſo to anſwer other purpoſes of eccleſiaſtical policy. We ſee, alſo, from an attentive view of this matter, that though the high order of purpled prelates, commonly called *cardinals*, had its riſe in the eleventh century, yet it does not ſeem to have acquired the ſtable and undiſputed authority of a legal council before the following age and the pontificate of ALEXANDER III.

VIII. Though NICOLAS II. had expreſsly acknowledged and confirmed in his edict the right of the emperor to ratify by his conſent the election of the pontif; his eyes were no ſooner cloſed, than the Romans, at the inſtigation of HILDEBRAND, archdeacon, and afterwards biſhop of *Rome*, violated this imperial privilege in the moſt preſumptuous manner. For they not only elected to the pontificate ANSELM, biſhop of *Lucca*, who aſſumed the name of ALEXANDER II., but alſo ſolemnly inſtalled him in that high office without ſo much as conſulting the emperor HENRY IV., or giving him the leaſt information of the matter. AGNES, the mother of the young emperor, no ſooner received an account of this irregular tranſaction by the biſhops of *Lombardy*, to whom the election of ANSELM was extremely diſagreeable, than ſhe aſſembled a council at *Baſil*, and, in order to maintain the authority of her ſon, who was yet a minor,

cauſed CADOLAUS, biſhop of *Parma*, to be created pontif, under the title of HONORIUS II. Hence aroſe a long and furious conteſt between the two rival pontifs, who maintained their reſpective pretenſions by the force of arms, and preſented a ſcene of bloodſhed and horror in the church of CHRIST, which was deſigned to be the centre of charity and peace. In this violent contention ALEXANDER triumphed, though he could never engage his obſtinate adverſary to deſiſt from his pretenſions [*t*].

IX. This conteſt, indeed, was of little conſequence when vieved in compariſon with the dreadful commotions which HILDEBRAND, who ſucceeded ALEXANDER, and aſſumed the name of GREGORY VII., excited both in church and ſtate; and nouriſhed and fomented until the end of his days. This vehement pontif, who was a Tuſcan, born of mean parents, roſe, by various ſteps, from the obſcure ſtation of a monk of *Clugni*, to the rank of archdeacon in the Roman church, and, from the time of LEO IX., who treated him with peculiar marks of diſtinction, was accuſtomed to govern the Roman pontifs by his counſels, which had acquired the higheſt degree of influence and authority. In the year 1073, and the ſame day that ALEXANDER was interred, he was raiſed to the pontificate by the unanimous ſuffrages of the cardinals, biſhops, abbots, monks, and people, and, conſequently, without any regard being paid to the edict of NICOLAS II., and his election was confirmed by the approbation and conſent of HENRY IV., king of the Romans, to whom ambaſſadors had been ſent for that purpoſe. This prince, indeed, had ſoon reaſon to

[*t*] FERDIN. UGHELLI *Italia Sacra*, tom. ii. p. 166.—Jo. JAC. MASCOVIUS, *De rebus imperii ſub Henrico* IV. et V., lib. i. p. 7.—FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontificum Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 385.—MURATORI *Annali d'Italia*, tom. vi. p. 214.

repent

repent of the conſent he had given to an election, which became ſo prejudicial to his own authority, ſo fatal to the intereſts and liberties of the church, and ſo detrimental, in general, to the ſovereignty and independence of kingdoms and empires [*u*]. HILDEBRAND was a man of uncommon genius, whoſe ambition in forming the moſt arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution; ſagacious, crafty, and intrepid, nothing could eſcape his penetration, defeat his ſtratagems, or daunt his courage; haughty and arrogant beyond all meaſure; obſtinate, impetuous, and intractable; he looked up to the ſummit of univerſal empire with a wiſhful eye, and laboured up the ſteep aſcent with uninterrupted ardour, and invincible perſeverance; void of all principle, and deſtitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he ſuffered little reſtraint in his audacious purſuits, from the dictates of religion or the remonſtrances of conſcience. Such was the character of HILDEBRAND, and his conduct was every way ſuitable to it; for no ſooner did he find himſelf in the papal chair, than he diſplayed to the world the moſt odious marks of his tyrannic ambition. Not contented to enlarge the juriſdiction, and to augment the opulence of the ſee of *Rome*, he laboured indefatigably to render the univerſal church ſubject to the deſpotic go-

[*u*] The writers, who have given the ampleſt accounts of the life and exploits of GREGORY VII., are enumerated by CASP. SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introd. ad Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. i. p. 687. and by AND. SCHMIDIUS, in his *Supplement*, tom. ii. p. 627.—See alſo the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. v. *Maii ad d.* xxv. p. 568. and MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ordin. Benedicti Sæcul.* vi. p. 406. Add to theſe the *Life of* GREGORY VII., publiſhed at *Frankfort* in the year 1710, by JUST. CHRISTOPHER DITHMAR, as alſo the authors who have written the hiſtory of the conteſts that aroſe between the Empire and the Hierarchy of *Rome*, and of the wars that were occaſioned by the diſpute concerning *Inveſtitures*.

vernment

vernment and the arbitrary power of the pontif alone, to diſſolve the juriſdiction which kings and emperors had hitherto exerciſed over the various orders of the clergy, and to exclude them from all part in the management or diſtribution of the revenues of the church. Nay, this outrageous pontif went ſtill farther, and impiouſly attempted to ſubmit to his juriſdiction the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth, and to render their dominions tributary to the ſee of *Rome*. Such were the *pious* and *apoſtolic* exploits that employed the activity of GREGORY VII. during his whole life, and which render his pontificate a continual ſcene of tumult and bloodſhed. Were it neceſſary to bring any farther proofs of his tyranny and arrogance, his fierce impetuoſity and boundleſs ambition, we might appeal to thoſe famous *ſentences*, which are generally called, after him, the *dictates of* HILDEBRAND, and which ſhew, in a lively manner, the ſpirit and character of this reſtleſs pontif [*w*].

X. Under

[*w*] *Dictatus Hildebrandini*. By theſe are underſtood twenty-ſeven apophthegms, or ſhort ſentences, relating to the ſupreme authority of the Roman pontifs over the univerſal church, and the kingdoms of the world, which are to be found in the ſecond book of the Epiſtles of GREGORY VII., between the fifty-fifth and the fifty-ſixth Epiſtle, under the title of *Dictatus Papæ*, i. e. *Dictates of the Pope*. See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. vi. part I. p. 1304, and the various writers of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. BARONIUS LUPUS *, and other hiſtorians, who have ſignalized, upon all occaſions, their vehement attachment to the Roman pontifs, maintain, that theſe *Dictates* were drawn up by GREGORY VII., and propoſed as laws in a certain council; and hence the *Proteſtant* writers have ventured to attribute them to HILDEBRAND. But the learned JOHN LAUNOY, NATALIS ALEXANDER, ANTONY † and FRANCIS PAGI ‡, ELIAS DU PIN, and other authors of

* LUPUS, in his *Notæ et Diſſertationes in Concilia*, tom. vi. opp. p. 164. has given us an ample commentary on the *Dictates of* HILDEBRAND, which he looks upon as both authentic and ſacred.

† See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*.

‡ See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 473. note,

CENT. XI. PART II.

His exploits.

X. Under the pontificate of HILDEBRAND, the face of the Latin church was entirely changed, its government ſubverted, and the moſt important and valuable of thoſe rights and privileges, that had been formerly veſted in its councils, biſhops, and ſacred colleges, were uſurped by the greedy pontif. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the weight of this tyrannic uſurpation did not fall equally upon all the European provinces; ſeveral of theſe provinces preſerved ſome remains of their ancient liberty and independence, in the

note, affirm in the moſt poſitive manner that theſe *ſentences*, or *dictates*, were a downright forgery impoſed upon the world under the name of GREGORY, by ſome perfidious impoſtor, who propoſed thereby to flatter the Roman pontifs in their ambitious pretenſions. As a proof of this aſſertion, they obſerve, that while ſome of theſe *ſentences* expreſs indeed in a lively manner the ambitious ſpirit of GREGORY, there are others which appear entirely oppoſite to the ſentiments of that pontif, as they are delivered in ſeveral parts of his *Epiſtles*. The French writers have important reaſons (which it is not neceſſary to mention here) for affirming that no Roman pontif ever preſumed to ſpeak of the papal power and juriſdiction in ſuch arrogant terms as are here put into the mouth of GREGORY. It may be eaſily granted, that theſe *ſentences*, in their preſent *form*, are not the compoſition of this famous pontif; for many of them are obſcure, and they are all thrown together without the leaſt order, method, or connexion; and it is not to be imagined, that a man of ſuch genius, as GREGORY diſcovered, would have neglected either perſpicuity or preciſion in deſcribing the authority, and fixing, what he looked upon to be, the rights and privileges of the biſhops of *Rome*. But, notwithſtanding all this, if we conſider the *matter* of theſe *ſentences*, we ſhall be entirely perſuaded that they belong originally to HILDEBRAND, ſince we find the greateſt part of them repeated word for word in ſeveral places in his *Epiſtles*, and ſince ſuch of them as appear inconſiſtent with ſome paſſages in theſe epiſtles, are not ſo in reality, but may be eaſily explained in perfect conformity with what they are ſaid to contradict. The moſt probable account of the matter ſeems to be this: That ſome mean author extracted theſe ſentences, partly from the epiſtles of GREGORY that are yet extant, partly from thoſe that have periſhed in the ruins of time, and publiſhed them in the form in which they now appear, without judgment or method.

poſſeſſion

poſſeſſion of which a variety of circumſtances happily concurred to maintain them.

But, as we inſinuated above, the views of HILDEBRAND were not confined to the erection of an abſolute and univerſal monarchy in the church; they aimed alſo at the eſtabliſhment of a civil monarchy equally extenſive and deſpotic; and this aſpiring pontif, after having drawn up a ſyſtem of eccleſiaſtical canons for the government of the church, would have introduced alſo a new code of political laws, had he been permitted to execute the plan he had formed. His purpoſe was to engage in the bonds of fidelity and allegiance to St. PETER, *i. e.* to the Roman pontifs, all the kings and princes of the earth, and to eſtabliſh at *Rome* an annual aſſembly of biſhops, by whom the conteſts that might ariſe between kingdoms or ſovereign ſtates were to be decided, the rights and pretenſions of princes to be examined, and the fate of nations and empires to be determined. This ambitious project met, however, with the warmeſt oppoſition, particularly from the vigilance and reſolution of the emperors, and alſo from the Britiſh and French monarchs [*x*].

That HILDEBRAND laid this audacious plan is undoubtedly evident, both from his own epiſtles, and alſo from other authentic records of antiquity. The nature of the oath which he drew up for the king or emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profeſſion of ſubjection and allegiance [*y*], ſhews abundantly the arrogance of his

☞ [*x*] The long note [*g*] in the original, which contains the ambitious exploits of HILDEBRAND, is inſerted in the following paragraph, except the citations, which are thrown into notes.

[*y*] See the ninth book of his epiſtles, *Epiſt.* iii. the form of the oath runs thus: *Ab hac hora et deinceps fidelis ero per rectam fidem B. Petro Apoſtolo, ejuſque vicario Papæ Gregorio .... et quodcunque ipſe Papa præceperit ſub his videlicet verbis:*

PER

CENT. XI. PART II.

his pretenſions. But his conduct towards the kingdom of *France* is worthy of particular notice. It is well known, that whatever dignity and dominion the popes enjoyed was originally derived from the kingdom of *France*, or, which is the ſame thing, from the princes of that nation; and yet HILDEBRAND, or (as we ſhall hereafter entitle him) GREGORY VII., pretended that the kingdom of *France* was tributary to the ſee of *Rome*, and commanded his legates to demand yearly, in the moſt ſolemn manner, the payment of that tribute [z]; their demands, however, were treated with contempt, and the tribute was never either acknowledged or offered. Nothing can be more inſolent than the language in which GREGORY addreſſed himſelf to PHILIP I., king of *France*, to whom he recommends an humble and obliging carriage, from this conſideration that both his *kingdom and his ſoul were under the dominion of St.* PETER (*i. e.* his vicar the Roman pontif), who had *the power to* BIND *and to* LOOSE *him, both in heaven and upon earth* [a]. Nothing eſcaped the all-graſping ambition of GREGORY; he pretended that *Saxony* was a feudal tenure held in ſubjection to the ſee of Rome, to which it had been formerly yielded by CHARLEMAGNE as a

PER VERAM OBEDIENTIAM, *fideliter, ſicut oportet Chriſtianum, obſervabo. Et eo die, quando eum primitus videro, fideliter per manus meas miles Sancti Petri et* ILLIUS *efficiat.* What is this elſe than a *formal oath of allegiance?*

[z] *Epiſt.* lib. viii. ep. xxiii. in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, tom. vi. p. 1476. *Dicendum autem eſt omnibus Gallis et per veram obedientiam præcipiendum, ut unaquæque domus ſaltem unum denarium annuatim ſolvat Beato Petro, ſi eum recognoſcant patrem et paſtorem ſuum more antiquo.* Every one knows that the demand that was made with the form, *per veram obedientiam*, was ſuppoſed to oblige indiſpenſably.

[a] Lib. vii. epiſt. xx. in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, tom. vi. p. 1468. *Maxime enitere ut B. Petrum, in cujus poteſtate eſt regnum tuum et anima tua, qui te poteſt in cælo et in terra ligare et abſolvere, tibi facias debitorem.*

pious

pious offering to St. PETER. He extended alſo his pretenſions to the kingdom of *Spain*, maintaining, in one of his letters [*b*], that it was the property of the apoſtolic ſee from the earlieſt times of the church, yet acknowledging in another [*c*], that the tranſaction by which the ſucceſſors of St. PETER had acquired this property, had been loſt among other ancient records. His claims, however, were more reſpected in *Spain* than they had been in *France*; for it is proved moſt evidently by authentic records, that the king of *Arragon*, and BERNHARD, count of *Beſalu*, gave a favourable anſwer to the demands of GREGORY, and paid him regularly an annual tribute [*d*]; and their example was followed by other Spaniſh princes, as we could ſhew, were it neceſſary, by a variety of arguments. The deſpotic views of this lordly pontif were attended with leſs ſucceſs in *England*, than in any other country. WILLIAM the Conqueror was a prince of great ſpirit and reſolution, extremely jealous of his rights, and tenacious of the prerogatives he enjoyed as a ſovereign and independent monarch; and accordingly, when GREGORY wrote him a letter demanding the arrears of the *Peter-pence* [*e*], and

[*b*] Lib. x. ep. vii. *Regnum Hiſpaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuiſſe et ſoli Apoſtolicæ ſedi ex æquo pertinere.*

[*c*] Lib. x. epiſt. xxviii.

[*d*] See PETRUS DE MARCA, *Hiſtoire de Bearn*, lib. iv. p. 331, 332.

☞ [*e*] *Peter-pence* (ſo called from its being collected on the feſtival of *St. Peter in Vinculis*) was an ancient tax of a penny on each houſe, firſt granted, in the year 725, by INA, king of the Weſt-Saxons, for the eſtabliſhment and ſupport of an Engliſh college at *Rome*, and afterwards extended, in the year 794, by OFFA, over all *Mercia* and *Eaſt-Anglia*. In proceſs of time it became a ſtanding and general tax throughout all *England*, and, though it was for ſome time applied to the ſupport of the Engliſh college according to its original deſign, the popes found means to appropriate it to themſelves. It was confirmed

and at the ſame time ſummoning him to do homage for the kingdom of *England* as a fief of the apoſtolic ſee. WILLIAM granted the former, but refuſed the latter [*f*] with a noble obſtinacy, declaring that he held his kingdom of God only and his own ſword. Obliged to yield to the obſtinacy of the Engliſh monarch, whoſe name ſtruck terror into the boldeſt hearts, the reſtleſs pontif addreſſed his imperious mandates where he imagined they would be received with more facility. He wrote circular letters to all the moſt powerful German princes [*g*], to GEUSA king of *Hungary* [*h*], and SUENO, or SWEIN, king of *Denmark* [*i*], ſoliciting them to make a ſolemn grant of their kingdoms and territories to the prince of the apoſtles, and to hold them under the juriſdiction of his vicar at *Rome*, as fiefs of the apoſtolic ſee. What ſucceſs attended his demands upon theſe princes, we cannot ſay; but certain it is, that in ſeveral places his efforts were

confirmed by the laws of CANUTE, EDWARD the Confeſſor, WILLIAM the Conqueror, *&c.* and was never totally aboliſhed till the reign of HENRY VIII.

[*f*] The letter of WILLIAM is extant in the *Miſcellanea* of BALUZIUS, tom. vii. p. 127. as alſo in COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, in the *Collection of Records*, at the end of the firſt volume, p. 713, No. 12. *Hubertus legatus tuus* (ſays the reſolute monarch to the audacious pontif) *admonuit me, quatenus tibi et ſucceſſoribus tuis fidelitatem facerem, et de pecunia, quam anteceſſores mei ad eccleſiam mittere ſolebant, melius cogitarem. Unum admiſi, alterum non admiſi.* FIDELITATEM FACERE, NOLUI NEC VOLO, &c.

[*g*] See in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, his famous letter (lib. ix. epiſt. iii.) to the biſhop of *Padua*, exhorting him to engage WELPHO, duke of *Bavaria*, and other German princes, to ſubmit themſelves and their dominions to the apoſtolic juriſdiction. *Admonere te volumus* (ſays the pontif) *Ducem Welphonem, ut fidelitatem B. Petro faciat . . . Illum enim totum in gremio Beati Petri collocare deſideramus et ad ejus ſervitium ſpecialiter provocare. Quam voluntatem ſi in eo, vel etiam in aliis potentibus viris amore B. Petri ductis cognoveris, ut perficiant elabora.*

[*h*] Lib. ii. ep. lxx.

[*i*] Lib. ii. ep. li.

effectual,

effectual, and his *modeſt* propoſals were received with the utmoſt docility and zeal. The ſon of DEMETRIUS, king of the *Ruſſians*, ſet out for *Rome*, in conſequence of the pontif's letter [*k*], in order to *obtain, as a gift from St.* PETER, *by the hands of* GREGORY, *after profeſſing his ſubjection and allegiance to the prince of the apoſtles, the kingdom* which was to devolve to him upon the death of his father; and his *pious requeſt* was readily granted by the officious pope, who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. DEMETRIUS SUINIMER, duke of *Croatia* and *Dalmatia*, was raiſed to the rank and prerogatives of royalty by the ſame pontif in the year 1076, and ſolemnly proclaimed king by his legate at *Salona*, upon condition that he ſhould pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of gold to St. PETER at every Eaſter feſtival [*l*]. This bold ſtep was injurious to the authority of the emperors of *Conſtantinople*, who, before this time, comprehended the province of *Croatia* within the limits of their ſovereignty. The kingdom of *Poland* became alſo the object of GREGORY's ambition, and a favourable occaſion was offered for the execution of his iniquitous views; for BASILAUS II., having aſſaſſinated STANISLAUS biſhop of *Cracow*, the pontif not only excommunicated him with all the circumſtances of infamy that he could invent, but alſo pulled him from his throne, diſſolved the oath of allegiance which his ſubjects had taken, and, by an expreſs and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of *Poland* from electing a new king without the conſent of the Roman pontif [*m*]. Many more examples might be alleged of the phrenetic ambition of GREGORY, but thoſe

CENT. XI. PART II.

[*k*] Lib. ii. ep. lxxiv.

[*l*] See DU MONT, *Corps Diplomatique*, tom. i. part I. *n.* 88. p. 53.—JO. LUCIUS, *De regno Dalmatiæ*, lib. ii. p. 85.

[*m*] See DLUGOSSI *Hiſtor. Polon.* tom. i. p. 295.

which have been already mentioned are ſufficient to excite the indignation of every impartial reader. Had the ſucceſs of that pontif been equal to the extent of his inſolent views, all the kingdoms of *Europe* would have been this day tributary to the Roman ſee, and its princes the ſoldiers or vaſſals of St. PETER, in the perſon of his pretended vicar upon earth. But though his moſt important projects were ineffectual, yet many of his attempts were crowned with a favourable iſſue; for, from the time of his pontificate the face of *Europe* underwent a conſiderable change, and the prerogatives of the emperors and other ſovereign princes were much diminiſhed. It was, particularly, under the adminiſtration of GREGORY, that the emperors were deprived of the privilege of ratifying, by their conſent, the election of the Roman pontif; a privilege of no ſmall importance, and which as yet they have never recovered.

XI. The zeal and activity which GREGORY employed in extending the juriſdiction of the Roman ſee, and enriching the patrimony of St. PETER, met, no where, with ſuch remarkable ſucceſs as in *Italy*. His intimate familiarity with MATHILDA, the daughter of BONIFACE duke of *Tuſcany*, and the moſt powerful and opulent princeſs in that country (who found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguiſhed the tender paſſions in the heart of GREGORY), contributed much to this ſucceſs; for he engaged that princeſs, after the death of her huſband GODFREY, duke of *Lorrain*, and her mother BEATRIX, which happened in the years 1076 and 1077, to ſettle all her poſſeſſions in *Italy* and elſewhere upon the church of *Rome*, and thus to appoint St. PETER and his pretended vicar the heirs of her immenſe treaſures. This rich donation was, indeed, conſiderably invalidated by the ſecond marriage, which MATHILDA contracted, in the year 1089,

with WELPH, or GUELPH, ſon of the duke of *Bavaria*, and that with the conſent of the Roman pontif URBAN II. She, however, renewed it in a ſolemn manner in the year 1102, about ſeven years after her ſeparation from her ſecond huſband, by which ſhe became again ſole miſtreſs of her vaſt poſſeſſions [*n*]. But, notwithſtanding this new act, the Roman pontifs did not remain in the peaceful poſſeſſion of this ſplendid inheritance. It was warmly and powerfully diſputed, firſt by the emperor HENRY V., and afterwards by ſeveral other princes; nor were the pontifs ſo ſucceſsful in this conteſt as to preſerve the whole inheritance, though, after various ſtruggles and efforts, they remained in the poſſeſſion of a conſiderable part of it, which they ſtill enjoy [*o*].

XII. The

[*n*] The life and exploits of this heroic princeſs (who was one of the ſtrongeſt bulwarks of the Roman church againſt the power of the emperors, and the moſt tender and obedient of all the *ſpiritual* daughters of GREGORY VII.) has been written by BENED. LUCHINUS, DOMIN. MELLINUS, FELIX CONTELORIUS, JULIUS DE PUTEO, but more amply by FRANCIS MARIA FLORENT. in his *Records concerning the counteſs Mathilda*, written in Italian, and BENED. BACHINIUS, in his *Hiſtoria Monaſterii Podalironenſis*. The famous LEIBNITZ, in his *Scriptores Brunſvic*, tom. i. p. 629. and LUD. ANT. MURATORI, in his *Scriptores rerum Italic.* tom. v. p. 335. have publiſhed, with annotations, the ancient hiſtories of the life of MATHILDA, compoſed by DONIZO, and another writer whoſe name is unknown, together with the copy of the ſecond act of ceſſion by which that princeſs confirmed her former grant to the church of *Rome*. We may add here, that nothing relating to this extraordinary woman is more worthy of peruſal than the accounts that we find of her, and her ſecond huſband, in the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. v. p. 444. et tom. ii. lib. vi. p. 303.

[*o*] Many learned men conclude from the very act by which this *donation* was confirmed to the ſee of *Rome*, that MATHILDA comprehended in this donation only her *allodial* poſſeſſions, and not the territories which ſhe held as *fiefs of the empire*, ſuch as the marquiſate of *Tuſcany*, and the duchy of *Spoleto*. For the words of the act run thus: *Ego Mathildis . . , dedi et obtuli eccleſiæ S. Petri . . . omnia mea bona* JURE PROPRIETARIO, *tam*

CENT. XI. PART II.

The decrees of Gregory VII.

XII. The plan that GREGORY had formed for raiſing the church above all human authority, to a ſtate of perfect ſupremacy and independence, had many kinds of oppoſition to encounter, but none more unſurmountable than that which aroſe from the two reigning vices of *concubinage* and

tam quæ tunc habueram, quam ea, quæ in antea acquiſitura eram, ſive juris ſucceſſionis, ſive alio quocunque jure ad me pertineant. See the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. p. 448. But it is much to be queſtioned, whether this diſtinction is ſo evident as is pretended. For the words JURE PROPRIETARIO, from which it is inferred that MATHILDA diſpoſed of only her *allodial* poſſeſſions in favour of St. PETER, do not, in my opinion, relate to the poſſeſſions of the teſtatrix, but to the nature of the gift, and muſt be interpreted in conjunction with the preceding verbs, *dedi et obtuli*. For the princeſs does not ſay, *dedi omnia bona quæ* JURE PROPRIETARIO *poſſideo et habeo*, i. e. *I have granted that part of my property which I hold by a ſupreme and independent right*, in which caſe the opinion of the learned men above mentioned would be well founded, but ſhe ſays, *dedi omnia bona mea eccleſiæ* JURE PROPRIETARIO, i. e. *my will is, that the church ſhall poſſeſs as its own property the inheritance I have left it.* Beſides, the following words manifeſtly ſhew, that the opinion of theſe learned men is deſtitute of all foundation; ſince MATHILDA could not poſſibly add, *ſive jure ſucceſſionis, ſive* ALIO QUOCUNQUE JURE *ad me pertineant*, i. e. *I grant all my poſſeſſions under whatever title I enjoy them, whether by right of ſucceſſion, or by* ANY OTHER RIGHT, &c. had ſhe deſigned to confine her donation to her *allodial* poſſeſſions. Certain it is, that in this ample grant ſhe excepts no particular part of her property, but evidently comprehends in it her whole ſubſtance. If it be objected to this, that the Roman pontifs never affirmed that the *fiefs of the empire*, which MATHILDA poſſeſſed, were comprehended in this grant to their church, and that they only claimed her *allodial* and independent poſſeſſions; I anſwer, by queſtioning the fact, ſince many circumſtances concur to prove, that theſe pontifs claimed the whole ſubſtance of MATHILDA, all her poſſeſſions without exception, as their undoubted right. But ſuppoſe for a moment, that the caſe was otherwiſe, and that the Roman church had never made ſuch an univerſal claim, this would, by no means, invalidate the opinion I here maintain; ſince the queſtion, under conſideration, is not, how far the Roman pontifs may have moderated their pretenſions to the territories of MATHILDA, but what is the true and genuine ſenſe of the words in which her donation is expreſſed.

ſimony,

ſimony, that had infected the whole body of the European clergy. The Roman pontifs, from the time of STEPHEN IX., had combated, with zeal and vehemence, theſe monſtrous vices [*p*], but without

[*p*] *Monſtrous vices* we may juſtly call them. For though it be true, that in the methods GREGORY took to extirpate theſe vices, he violated not only the laws of religion, but alſo the dictates of natural equity and juſtice, and, under the maſk of a pious zeal, committed the moſt crying and abominable enormities; yet it is certain, on the other hand, that theſe vices produced the moſt unhappy effects both in church and ſtate, and that the ſuppreſſion of them was now become abſolutely neceſſary. There were indeed, among the clergy, ſeveral men of piety and virtue, who lived in the bonds of wedlock, and theſe GREGORY ought to have ſpared. But there was alſo a prodigious number of eccleſiaſtics throughout *Europe*, not only of prieſts and canons, but alſo of monks, who lived in the bonds of a criminal love, kept, under the title of wives, miſtreſſes which they diſmiſſed, at pleaſure, to enjoy the ſweets of a licentious variety, and who not only ſpent, in the moſt profuſe and ſcandalous manner, the revenues and treaſures of the churches and convents to which they belonged, but even diſtributed a great part of them among their baſtards. As to the vice of *ſimony*, its univerſal extent and its pernicious fruits appear evidently from thoſe records, which the Benedictine monks have publiſhed in ſeveral places of their *Gallia Chriſtiana*, not to mention a multitude of other ancient papers to the ſame purpoſe. One or two examples will be ſufficient to give the reader an idea of this matter. We find in the firſt volume of the admirable work now mentioned (in the *Append. Document.* p. 5.) a public act, by which BERNARD a viſcount, and FROTERIUS biſhop of *Alby*, grant, or rather ſell, openly to BERNARD AIMARD and his ſon the biſhopric of *Alby*, reſerving to themſelves a conſiderable part of its revenues. This act is followed by another, in which count PONTIUS bequeaths to his wife the ſame biſhopric of *Alby* in the following terms: *Ego Pontius dono tibi dilectæ ſponſæ meæ epiſcopatum Albienſem — cum ipſa eccleſia et cum omnia adjacentia ſua — et medietatem de epiſcopatu Nemauſo — et medietatem de abbatia Sti. Ægidii — poſt obitum tuum remaneat ipſius alodis ad infantes qui de me erunt creati.*—In the ſecond volume of the ſame learned work (in the *Append. Document.* p. 173.) there is a letter of the *clergy of Limoges*, beſeeching WILLIAM, count of *Aquitain*, not to ſell the biſhopric, but to give them a paſtor, and not a devourer of the flock. *Rogamus tuam pietatem, ne propter mundiale lucrum vendas*

CENT. XI. PART II.

without ſucceſs, as they were become too inveterate and too univerſal to be extirpated without the greateſt difficulty and the moſt extraordinary efforts. Accordingly GREGORY, in the year 1074, which was the ſecond of his pontificate, exerted himſelf with much more vigour than his predeceſſors had done in oppoſition to the vices already mentioned. For this purpoſe he aſſembled a council at *Rome*, in which all the laws of the former pontifs againſt *ſimony* were renewed and confirmed, and the buying or ſelling eccleſiaſtical benefices prohibited in the ſtricteſt and ſevereſt manner. It was alſo decreed in the ſame council, that the ſacerdotal orders ſhould abſtain from marriage; and that ſuch of them as had already wives, or concubines, ſhould immediately diſmiſs them, or quit the prieſtly office. Theſe decrees were accompanied with circular letters wrote by the pontif to all the European biſhops, enjoining the ſtricteſt obedience to the deciſions of this ſolemn council, under the ſevereſt penalties. GREGORY did not ſtop here, but ſent ambaſſadors into *Germany* to HENRY VI., king of the Romans, in or-

vendas Sti. Stephani locum, quia ſi tu vendis epiſcopalia, ipſe noſtra mandycabit communia—Mitte nobis ovium cuſtodem, non devoratorem. ADEMAR, viſcount of *Limoges*, laments (tom. ii. p. 179.), that *he himſelf had formerly made traffic of the cure of ſouls by ſelling benefices to ſimoniacal abbots.* The barefaced impudence of the ſacerdotal orders, in buying and ſelling benefices, exceeded all meaſure, and almoſt all credibility. And they carried matters ſo far as to juſtify that abominable traffic, as may be ſeen in a remarkable paſſage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, which is added, by PITHOU, to the *Codex Can. Eccleſiæ Romanæ*; this paſſage, which deſerves to be quoted, is as follows: *Nihil pene ad eccleſiam pertinere videtur, quod ad pretium non largiatur, ſcilicet epiſcopatus, preſbyteratus, diaconatus, et aliqui minores gradus, archidiaconatus quoque, decania, præpoſitura, theſauri cuſtodia, baptiſterium—et hujuſmodi negociatores ſubdola reſponſione ſolent aſtruere, non ſe emere benedictionem, quâ percipitur gratia ſpiritus ſancti, ſed res eccleſiarum vel poſſeſſiones epiſcopi.* An acute diſtinction truly!

der

der to engage that prince to ſummon a council for the trial and puniſhment of ſuch eccleſiaſtics as had been hitherto guilty of ſimoniacal practices.

The ſevere proceedings of the pontif againſt concubinage produce much trouble.

XIII. Theſe decrees, which were in part equitable and juſt, and which were, in every reſpect, conformable with the notions of religion that prevailed in this age, were looked upon by the people as highly ſalutary, ſince they rendered a free election, and not a mercenary purchaſe, the way to eccleſiaſtical promotion, and obliged the prieſts to abſtain from marriage, which was abſurdly conſidered as inconſiſtent with the ſanctity of their office. Yet both theſe decrees were attended with the moſt deplorable tumults and diſſentions, and were fruitful, in their conſequences, of innumerable calamities. No ſooner was the law concerning the *Celibacy of the Clergy* publiſhed, than the prieſts, in the ſeveral provinces of *Europe*, who lived in the bonds of marriage with lawful wives, or of laſciviouſneſs with hired concubines [*q*], complained loudly of the

[*q*] All the hiſtorians who give any account of this century, mention the tumults excited by ſuch prieſts, as were reſolved to continue with their wives or concubines. For an account of the ſeditions which aroſe in *Germany* upon this occaſion, ſee SIGONIUS *De regno Italiæ*, lib. ix. p. 557. tom. ii. as alſo TENGNAGEL's *Collectio Veter. Monument.* p. 45. 47. 54. Thoſe that the prieſts excited in *England* are mentioned by M. PARIS, in his *Hiſtor. Major.* lib. i. p. 7. The tumults occaſioned by the ſame reaſon in the Belgic and Gallic provinces, are deſcribed in the *Epiſtola Clericorum Cameracenſium ad Remenſes pro uxoribus ſuis*, publiſhed in MABILLON's *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. v. p. 634. and in the *Epiſtola Noviomenſium Clericorum ad Cameracenſes*, publiſhed in MABILLON's *Muſeum Italicum*, tom. i. p. 128. Great was the flame which the laws of GREGORY excited in *Italy*, and particularly in the province of *Milan*, of which we have an ample relation given by ARNULPH and LANDULPH, two Milaneſe hiſtorians, whoſe works are publiſhed, with annotations, by MURATORI, in his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iv. p. 36. Both theſe hiſtorians maintain, againſt GREGORY and his ſucceſſors, the cauſe of the injured prieſts, and the lawfulneſs of their marriages.

CENT. XI. PART II.

ſeverity of this council, and excited the moſt dreadful tumults in the greateſt part of the European provinces. Many of theſe eccleſiaſtics, eſpecially the Milaneſe prieſts, choſe rather to abandon their ſpiritual dignities than their ſenſual pleaſures, and to quit their benefices that they might cleave to their wives. They went ſtill farther: for they ſeparated themſelves entirely from the church of *Rome*, and branded with the infamous name of *Paterini* [r], i. e. Mani-

[r] *Paterinus* is one of the names by which the Paulicians or Manichæans (who came during this century from *Bulgaria* into *Italy*, and were alſo known by the title of *Cathari* or *Puri*) were diſtinguiſhed among the Italians. But in proceſs of time the term *Paterinus* became a common name for all kinds of heretics, as we might ſhew by many examples taken from the writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There are various opinions concerning the origin of this word, the moſt probable of which is that which ſuppoſes it derived from a certain place called *Pataria*, in which the heretics held their aſſemblies; and it is well known, that a part of the city of *Milan* is, to this very day, called *Pataria*, or *Contrada de Patarri*. See *Annotat. ad Arnulphum Mediolanenſis* in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* tom. iv. p. 39. ſee alſo SAXIUS *ad Sigonium de Regno Italiæ*, lib. ix. p. 536. tom. ii. opp. *Sigonii*. An opinion (of which, if I am not miſtaken, SIGONIUS was the author) prevailed, that the name in queſtion was given to the Milaneſe prieſts, who ſeparated from the church of *Rome*, and retained their wives in oppoſition to the laws of the pontifs. But this opinion is without foundation; and it appears evidently from the teſtimony of ARNULPH and other hiſtorians, that it was not the married prieſts, but the faction of the pontifs, who condemned their conjugal bonds, that were branded with the opprobrious name of *Paterini*. See ARNULPH, lib. iii. c. x.—ANTON. PAGI. *Crit. in Ann. Bar.* t. iii. *ad A.* 1057. § iii.—LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 82. who have demonſtrated this in the moſt ample, learned, and ſatisfactory manner. Nor need we, indeed, look any where elſe for the origin of this word. It is abundantly known, that the Manichæans, and their brethren the Paulicians, were extremely averſe to marriage, which they looked upon as an inſtitution invented by the *evil principle*; they, of conſequence, who conſidered the marriages of the clergy as lawful, employed the ignominious name of *Paterini*, to ſhew that the pontifs, who prohibited theſe marriages, were followers of the odious doctrine of the Manichæans.

chæans,

chæans, the pontif and his adherents, who condemned so unjustly the conduct of such priests as entered into the bonds of a lawful and virtuous wedlock. The proceedings of GREGORY appeared to the wiser part even of those who approved of the celibacy of the clergy, unjust and criminal in two respects: First, in that his severity fell indiscriminately and with equal fury upon the virtuous husband and the licentious rake; that he dissolved, with a mercileſs hand, the chastest bonds of wedlock, and thus involved husbands and wives, with their tender offspring, in disgrace, perplexity, anguish, and want [*s*]. The second thing criminal in the measures taken by this pontif was, that instead of chastising the married priests with wisdom and moderation, and according to the laws of ecclesiastical discipline, whose nature is wholly spiritual, he gave them over to the civil magistrate, to be punished as

[*s*] We must always remember that the priests, to whom their wives or mistresses were much dearer than the laws of the pontifs, were not all of the same character; nor were such of them as might be justly esteemed criminal, all criminal in the same degree. The better sort of these ecclesiastics (among which we may count the Belgic and Milanese clergy) desired nothing more than to live after the manner of the Greeks, maintaining that it was lawful for a priest, before his consecration, to marry one virgin, though a plurality of wives was justly prohibited; and they grounded this their opinion upon the authority of St. AMBROSE. See Jo. PETRI PURICELLI *Dissertatio utrum S. Ambrosius clero suo Mediolan. permiserit, ut virgini semel nubere possent*, republished by MURATORI, in his *Scriptores Italic.* tom. iv. p. 123. GREGORY and his successors ought to have dealt more gently with this kind of ecclesiastics (as the warmest admirers of the pontifs acknowledge) than with those priests, who were either the patrons of concubinage, or who pretended to justify their espousing a plurality of wives. It was also unjust to treat, in the same manner, the monks, who, by the nature of their profession and vows, were necessarily excluded from the nuptial state; and the priests, who could not bear the thoughts of being torn from the chaste partners of their bed, whom they had espoused with virtuous sentiments and upright intentions, nor from the tender offspring which were the fruit of virtuous love.

disobedient

diſobedient and unworthy ſubjects, with the loſs of their ſubſtance, and with the moſt ſhocking marks of undeſerved infamy and diſgrace [*t*].

The diſpute concerning inveſtitures occaſioned by the laws againſt ſimony.

XIV. This vehement conteſt excited great tumults and diviſions, which, however, were gradually calmed through length of time, and alſo by the perſeverance of the obſtinate pontif; nor did any of the European kings and princes concern themſelves ſo much about the marriages of the clergy as to maintain their cauſe, and thereby to prolong the controverſy. But the troubles that aroſe from the law that regarded the extirpation of *ſimony* were not ſo eaſily appeaſed; the tumults it occaſioned grew greater from day to day; the methods of reconciliation more difficult; and it involved both ſtate and church during ſeveral years in the deepeſt calamities and in the moſt complicated ſcenes of confuſion and diſtreſs [*u*]. HENRY IV., received indeed graciouſly the

[*t*] THEODORICUS, *Verdun. Epiſtola ad Gregorium* VII. *in Martene Theſauro Anecdotorum*, tom. i. p. 218.—*Faciem meam in eo vel maxime confuſione perfundunt, quod legem de Clericorum incontinentia* PER LAICORUM INSANIAS *cohibenda unquam ſuſceperim.—Nec putetis eos qui ita ſentiunt . . . eccleſiaſticorum graduum incontinentiam talibus defenſionibus fovere velle. Honeſtam converſationem in deſiderio habent, nec aliter, quam oportet,* ECCLESIASTICÆ ULTIONIS CENSURAM *ententari gaudent.*

[*u*] We have extant a great number both of ancient and modern writers, who have related the circumſtances of this diſpute concerning *inveſtitures*, which was begun by GREGORY VII., was carried on by him and his ſucceſſors on the one ſide, and the emperors HENRY IV. and V. on the other, and became a ſource of innumerable calamities to the greateſt part of *Europe*. But few or none of theſe writers have treated this weighty ſubject with an entire impartiality. They all plead either the cauſe of the pontifs, or that of the emperors, and decide the controverſy, not by the laws then in being (which ought, no doubt, to be principally conſulted), nor by the opinions that generally prevailed at the time of this conteſt, but by laws of their own invention, and by the opinions of modern times. The famous GRETSER, in his *Apologia pro Gregorio* VII., which is publiſhed in the ſixth volume of his works, and alſo ſeparately, has collected the principal of the ancient writers who maintained

the legates of GREGORY, and applauded his zeal for the extirpation of *simony*; but neither this prince, nor the German biſhops, would permit theſe legates to aſſemble a council in *Germany*, or to proceed judicially againſt thoſe, who, in time paſt, had been chargeable with ſimoniacal practices. The pontif, exaſperated at this reſtraint in the execution of his deſigns, called another council to meet at *Rome* in the year 1075, in which he purſued his adventurous project with greater impetuoſity and vehemence than ever; for he not only excluded from the communion of the church ſeveral German and Italian biſhops and certain favourites of HENRY, whoſe counſels that prince was ſaid to make uſe of in the traffic of eccleſiaſtical dignities, but alſo pronounced, in a formal edict, *Anathema againſt whoever received the inveſtiture of a biſhopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, as alſo againſt thoſe by whom the*

maintained the cauſe of the pontif: in oppoſition to whom, they who defended the cauſe of HENRY IV., are collected by MELCHIOR GOLDASTUS, in his *Replicatio contra Gretſerum et Apologia pro Henrico* IV., *Hanov.* 1611, 4to. Among the modern writers who have treated this ſubject, we may count the *Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes*, BARONIUS, the German and Italian hiſtorians, and thoſe who have wrote the life of the famous MATHILDA. But, beſide theſe, it will be highly proper to conſult Jo. SCHILTERUS, *De libertate Eccleſiæ Germanicæ*, lib. iv. p. 481.—CHRIST. THOMASIUS, *Hiſtoria contentionis inter Imperium et Sacerdotium.*—HEN. MEIBOMIUS, *Lib. de jure Inveſtituræ Epiſcopalis*, tom. iii. *Scriptorum rer. Germanicar.*—JUST. CHR. DITHMARUS, *Hiſtoria Belli inter Imperium et Sacerdotium*, publiſhed at *Francfort*, in 1741. in 8vo; and, above all, the famous Cardinal NORIS, who far ſurpaſſes in point of erudition thoſe whom we have mentioned, and whoſe *Iſtoria delle Inveſtiture, della dignità Eccleſiaſtiche*, which was publiſhed at *Mantua*, after his death, in the year 1741, is a moſt learned work, though it be imperfect and probably maimed, and alſo extremely partial in favour of the pontifs; which is not ſurpriſing from the pen of a cardinal. See alſo Jo. JAC. MASCOVII *Commentarii de rebus imperii Germanici ſub Henrico* IV. *et* V., publiſhed at *Leipſick*, in 4to. in the year 1749.

inveſtiture

CENT. XI. PART II.

inveſtiture ſhould be performed [*w*]. This decree was every way proper to ſurprize the emperors, kings, and princes of *Europe*, who, in conſequence of a prevailing cuſtom, had the right of conferring the more important eccleſiaſtical dignities, and the government of monaſteries and convents, of which they diſpoſed, in a ſolemn manner, by the well-known ceremony of the *ring* and the *ſtaff*, or *croſier*, which they preſented to the candidate on whom their choice fell. This ſolemn inveſtiture was the main ſupport of that power of creating biſhops and abbots, which the European princes claimed as their undoubted right, and the occaſion of that corrupt commerce called *ſimony*, in conſequence of which, eccleſiaſtical promotion was ſuddenly ſold to the higheſt bidder; and hence the zeal and ardour of GREGORY to annul theſe inveſtitures, that he might extirpate *ſimony* on the one hand, and diminiſh the power of princes in eccleſiaſtical matters on the other.

A ſhort digreſſion concerning INVESTITURES [*x*].

IT will not be improper to caſt ſome illuſtrations upon the cuſtom now mentioned, of inveſting biſhops and abbots in their reſpective dignities by the ceremony of the *ring* and *croſier*, ſince this cuſtom has been ill underſtood by ſome, and but imperfectly explained by others. Even the learned Cardinal NORIS appears highly defective here; for though, in his *Hiſtory of Inveſtitures* [*y*], there are many pertinent reflections upon the reaſons which engaged GREGORY to prohibit *inveſtitures* altogether, yet that learned prelate does

[*w*] ANT. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. *ad A.* 1075. —HEN. NORIS, *Hiſt. Inveſtiturarum*, p. 39.—CHRIST. LUPUS, *Scholia et Diſſertation. ad Concilia*, tom. vi. opp. p. 39—44.

[*x*] Here the tranſlator has tranſpoſed the note [*r*] of the original into text, under the form of a diſſertation.

[*y*] Chap. iii. p. 56.

not

not ſeem to have had a complete notion of this important matter, ſince he omits in his hiſtory certain points that are neceſſary to the underſtanding it thoroughly. The *inveſtiture* of biſhops and abbots commenced, undoubtedly, at that period of time when the European emperors, kings, and princes made grants to the clergy of certain territories, lands, foreſts, caſtles, *&c.* According to the laws of thoſe times (laws which ſtill remain in force) none were conſidered as lawful poſſeſſors of the lands or tenements which they derived from the emperors or other princes, before they repaired to court, took the oath of allegiance to their reſpective ſovereigns as the ſupreme proprietors, and received from their hands a ſolemn mark by which the property of their reſpective grants was transferred to them. Such was the manner in which the nobility, and thoſe who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves by military exploits, were confirmed in the poſſeſſions which they owed to the liberality of their ſovereigns. But the cuſtom of *inveſting* the biſhops and abbots with the *ring* and the *croſier*, which are the enſigns of the ſacred function, is of a much more recent date, and was then firſt introduced, when the European emperors and princes, annulling the elections that were made in the church according to the eccleſiaſtical laws that had been from the earlieſt times eſtabliſhed for that purpoſe, aſſumed to themſelves the power of conferring on whom they pleaſed the biſhoprics and abbeys that became vacant in their dominions, nay, even of ſelling them to the higheſt bidder. This power, then, being once uſurped by the kings and princes of *Europe*, they at firſt confirmed the biſhops and abbots in their dignities and poſſeſſions, with the ſame forms and ceremonies that were uſed in inveſting the counts, knights, and others, in their feudal tenures, even by written contracts,

and

and the ceremony of preſenting them with a wand or bough [z]. And this cuſtom of *inveſting* the *clergy* and the *laity* with the ſame ceremonies would have, undoubtedly, continued, had not the *clergy*, to whom the right of electing biſhops and abbots originally belonged, eluded artfully the uſurpation of the emperors and other princes by the following ſtratagem. When a biſhop or abbot died, they who looked upon themſelves as authoriſed to fill up the vacancy, elected immediately ſome one of their order in the place of the deceaſed, and were careful to have him conſecrated without delay. The conſecration being thus performed, the prince, who had propoſed to himſelf the profit of ſelling the vacant benefice, or the pleaſure of conferring it upon ſome of his favourites, was obliged to deſiſt from his purpoſe, and to conſent to the election, which the ceremony of conſecration rendered irrevocable. Many examples of the ſucceſs of this ſtratagem, which was practiſed both in chapters and monaſteries, and which diſappointed the liberality or avarice of ſeveral princes, might here be alledged; they abound in the records of the tenth century, to which we refer the curious reader. No ſooner did the emperors and princes perceive this artful management, than they turned their attention to the propereſt means of

[z] This appears from a paſſage in Cardinal HUMBERT's third Book, *Adverſus Simoniacos*, which was compoſed before GREGORY had ſet on foot the diſpute concerning *Inveſtitures*, and which is publiſhed in MARTENE's *Theſaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 787. The paſſage is as follows: *Poteſtas ſecularis primo ambitioſis eccleſiaſticarum dignitatum vel poſſeſſionum cupidis favebat prece, dein minis, deinceps verbis conceſſivis: in quibus omnibus cernens ſibi contradictorem neminem, nec qui moveret pennam, vel aperiret os et gänniret, ad majora progreditur, et jam ſub nomine* INVESTITURÆ DARE PRIMO TABELLAS *vel* QUALESCUMQUE PORRIGERE VIRGULAS, DEIN BACULOS.—*Quod maximum nefas ſic inolevit, ut id ſolum canonicum credatur, nec quæ ſit eccleſiaſtica regula ſciatur aut attendatur.*

rendering

rendering it ineffectual, and of preſerving the valuable privilege they had uſurped. For this purpoſe they ordered, that as ſoon as a biſhop expired, his *ring* and *croſier* ſhould be tranſmitted to the prince, to whoſe juriſdiction his dioceſe was ſubject. For it was by the ſolemn delivery of the *ring* and *croſier* of the deceaſed to the new biſhop that his election was irrevocably confirmed, and this ceremony was an eſſential part of his *conſecration*; ſo that, when theſe two badges of the epiſcopal dignity were in the hands of the ſovereign, the clergy could not *conſecrate* the perſon whom their ſuffrages had appointed to fill the vacancy. Thus their ſtratagem was defeated, as every election that was not confirmed by the ceremony of conſecration might be lawfully annulled and rejected; nor was the biſhop qualified to exerciſe any of the epiſcopal functions before the performance of that important ceremony. As ſoon, therefore, as a biſhop drew his laſt breath, the magiſtrate of the city in which he had reſided, or the governor of the province, ſeized upon his *ring* and *croſier*, and ſent them to court [*a*]. The emperor or prince conferred the vacant ſee upon the perſon whom he had choſen by delivering to him theſe two badges of the epiſcopal office, after which the new biſhop, thus inveſted by his ſovereign, repaired to his metropolitan,

[*a*] We ſee this fact confirmed in the following paſſage in EBBO's *Life of Otho, biſhop of Bamberg*, lib. i. § 8, 9. *in Actis Sanctor. menſis Julii*, tom. i. p. 426. *Nec multo poſt annulus cum virgâ paſtorali Bremenſis epiſcopi ad aulam regiam tranſlata eſt. Eo ſiquidem tempore eccleſia liberam electionem non habebant . . . ſed cum quilibet antiſtes viam univerſæ carnis ingreſſus fuiſſet, mox capitanei civitatis illius annulum et virgam paſtoralem ad Palatium tranſmittebant, ſicque regia auctoritate, communicato cum aulicis conſilio, orbatæ plebi idoneum conſtituebat præſulem . . . Poſt paucos vero dies rurſum annulus et virga paſtoralis Bambenbergenſis epiſcopi Domino imperatori tranſmiſſa eſt. Quo audito, multi nobiles—ad aulam regiam confluebant, qui alteram haram prece vel pretio ſibi comparare tentabant.*

tropolitan, to whom it belonged to perform the ceremony of conſecration, and delivered to him the *ring* and *croſier* which he had received from *his prince, that he might receive it again from his hands, and be thus doubly confirmed in his* ſacred function. It appears, therefore, from this account, that each new biſhop and abbot received twice the *ring* and the *croſier*; once from the hands of the ſovereign, and once from thoſe of the metropolitan biſhop, by whom they were conſecrated [*b*].

It is highly uncertain by what prince this cuſtom of creating the biſhops by the ceremonies of the *ring* and *croſier* was firſt introduced. If we may believe ADAM of *Bremen* [*c*], this privilege was exerciſed by LEWIS the Meek, who, in the ninth century, granted to the new biſhops the uſe and poſſeſſion of the epiſcopal revenues, and confirmed this grant by the ceremony now under conſideration. But the accuracy of this hiſtorian is liable to ſuſpicion; and it is extremely probable that he attributed to the tranſactions of ancient times the ſame form that accompanied ſimilar tranſactions in the eleventh century in which he lived. For it is certain, that in the ninth century the greateſt part of the European

[*b*] This appears from a variety of ancient records. See particularly HUMBERT, lib. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vi. in MARTENE's *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 779, in which we find the following paſſage: *Sic encæniatus* (i. e. the biſhops inveſted by the emperor) *violentus invadit clerum, plebem et ordinem prius dominaturus, quam ab eis cognoſcatur, quæratur, petatur. Sic metropolitanum aggreditur, non ab eo judicandus, ſed ipſum judicaturus.—Quid enim ſibi jam pertinet aut prodeſt baculum et annulum, quos portat* REDDERE? *Numquid quia laica perſona dati ſunt? Cur redditur quod habetur, niſi ut aut denus res eccleſiaſtica ſub hac ſpecie juſſionis vel donationis vendatur, aut certe ut preſumtio laicæ ordinationis pallietur colore et velamento quodam diſciplinæ clericalis.*

[*c*] In his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica*, lib. i. cap. xxxii. p. 10. xxxix. p. 12. publiſhed in the *Scriptores Septentrionales* of LINDENBROGIUS.

princes

princes made no oppoſition to the right of electing the biſhops, which was both claimed and exerciſed by the clergy and the people, and of conſequence, there was then no occaſion for the inveſtiture mentioned by ADAM of *Bremen* [*d*]. We therefore chuſe to adopt the ſuppoſition of Cardinal HUMBERT [*e*], who places the commencement of the cuſtom now under conſideration in the reign of OTHO the Great; for though this opinion has not the approbation of LEWIS THOMASSIN and NATALIS ALEXANDER, yet theſe learned men, in their deep reſearches into the origin of inveſtitures [*f*], have advanced nothing ſufficient to prove it erroneous. We learn alſo from HUMBERT [*g*], that the emperor HENRY III., the ſon of CONRAD II., was deſirous of abrogating theſe *inveſtitures*, though a variety of circumſtances concurred to prevent the execution of his deſign; but he repreſents HENRY I. king of *France* in a different point of light, as a turbulent prince, who turned all things into confuſion, and indulged himſelf beyond all meaſure in ſimoniacal practices, and loads him, of conſequence, with the bittereſt invectives. CENT. XI. PART II.

In this method of creating biſhops and abbots, by preſenting to them the *ring* and *croſier*, there were two things that gave particular offence to the Roman pontifs. The firſt was, that by this the ancient right of election was totally changed, and the power of chuſing the rulers of the church was uſurped by the emperors and other ſovereign princes, and was confined to them alone. This

[*d*] Add to this the refutation of ADAM of *Bremen*, by DANIEL PAPEBROCH, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. *Febr.* p. 557.

[*e*] HUMBERT, lib. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vii. p. 780. et cap. xi. p. 787.

[*f*] See LUDOV. THOMASSINI *Diſciplina Eccleſ. circa Benef.* tom. ii. lib. ii. p. 434. and NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Seleƈt. Hiſtor. Eccl. Capit. Sæc.* xi, xii. *Diſſ.* iv. p. 725.

[*g*] L. c. cap. vii. p. 780.

CENT. XI. PART II.

indeed was the moſt plauſible reaſon of complaint, when we conſider the religious notions of theſe times, which were, by no means, favourable to the conduct of the emperors in this matter. Another circumſtance that grievouſly diſtreſſed the pretended vicars of St. PETER, was, to ſee the *ring* and *croſier*, the venerable badges of ſpiritual authority and ghoſtly diſtinction, delivered to the biſhop elect by the profane hands of unſanctified laymen; an abuſe this, which they looked upon as little better than ſacrilege. HUMBERT, who, as we already obſerved, wrote his book againſt ſimony before the conteſt between the emperor and GREGORY had commenced, complains [*b*] heavily of this ſuppoſed profanation, and ſhudders to think, that that *ſtaff* which denotes the ghoſtly ſhepherd, and that *ring* which ſeals the myſteries of heaven [*i*], depoſited in the boſoms of the epiſcopal order, ſhould be polluted by the unhallowed touch of a civil magiſtrate; and that emperors and princes, by preſenting them to their favourites, ſhould thereby uſurp the prerogatives of the church, and exerciſe the paſtoral authority and power. This complaint was entirely conſiſtent, as we have already obſerved, with the opinions of the times in which it was made; for as the *ring* and the *croſier* were general-

[*b*] See HUMBERT, lib. iii. *contra Simoniac.* cap. vi. p. 779. 795. His words are: *Quid ad laicas pertinet perſonas ſacramenta eccleſiaſtica et pontificalem ſeu paſtoralem gratiam diſtribuere, camyros ſcilicet baculos et annulos, quibus præcipue perficitur, militat et innititur tota epiſcopalis conſecratio? Equidem in camyris baculis deſignatur, quæ eis committitur cura paſtoralis.— Porro annulus ſignaculum ſecretorum cœleſtium indicat, prædicatores, ut ſecretam Dei ſapientiam cum apoſtolo diſſignent.— Quicunque ergo his duobus aliquem initiant, procul dubio omnem paſtoralem auctoritatem hoc præſumendo ſibi vendicant.*

[*i*] HUMBERT miſtook the ſpiritual ſignification of this holy *ring*, which was the emblem of a nuptial bond between the biſhop and his ſee.

ly

ly eſteemed the marks and badges of paſtoral power, and ſpiritual authority, ſo he who conferred theſe ſacred badges was ſuppoſed to confer and communicate with them the ghoſtly authority of which they were the emblems.

All theſe things being duly conſidered, we ſhall immediately perceive what it was that rendered GREGORY VII. ſo averſe to the pretenſions of the emperors, and ſo zealous in depriving them of the privilege they had aſſumed of inveſting the biſhops with the ceremony of the *ring* and *croſier*. In the firſt council which he aſſembled at *Rome*, he made no attempt, indeed, againſt *inveſtitures*, nor did he aim at any thing farther than the abolition of *ſimony*, and the reſtoration of the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders to their ancient right of electing their reſpective biſhops and abbots. But when he afterwards came to know that the affair of *inveſtitures* was inſeparably connected with the pretenſions of the emperors, and indeed ſuppoſed them empowered to diſpoſe of the higher eccleſiaſtical dignities and benefices, he was then perſuaded that *ſimony* could not be extirpated as long as *inveſtitures* were in being; and therefore, to pluck up the evil by the root, he oppoſed the cuſtom of inveſtitures with the utmoſt vehemence. All this ſhews the true riſe of the war that was carried on between the pontif and the emperor with ſuch bitterneſs and fury.

And to underſtand ſtill more clearly the merits of this cauſe, it will be proper to obſerve, that it was not *inveſtitures*, conſidered in themſelves, that GREGORY oppoſed with ſuch keenneſs and obſtinacy, but that particular kind of *inveſtitures*, which were in uſe at this time. He did not pretend to hinder the biſhops from ſwearing allegiance to kings and emperors, nor even to become their *vaſſals*; and ſo far was he from prohibiting that kind of inveſtiture that was performed

by a verbal declaration or a written deed, that, on the contrary, he allowed the kings of *England* and *France* to *inveſt* in this manner, and probably conſented to the uſe of *ſceptre* in this ceremony, as did alſo after him CALLIXTUS II. But he could not bear the ceremony of *inveſtiture* that was performed with the enſigns of the ſacerdotal order, much leſs could he endure the performance of the ceremony before the ſolemn rite of conſecration; but what rendered *inveſtitures* moſt odious to this pontif was their deſtroying entirely the free elections of biſhops and abbots. It is now time to reſume the thread of our hiſtory.

History of the war that was kindled about *inveſtitures.*

XV. The ſevere law that had been enacted againſt *inveſtitures*, by the influence and authority of GREGORY, made very little impreſſion upon HENRY. He acknowledged, indeed, that in expoſing eccleſiaſtical benefices to ſale, he had done amiſs, and he promiſed amendment in that reſpect; but he remained inflexible againſt all attempts that were made to perſuade him to reſign his power of creating biſhops and abbots, and the right of *inveſtiture*, which was intimately connected with this important privilege. Had this emperor been ſeconded by the German princes, he might have maintained this refuſal with dignity and ſucceſs; but this was far from being the caſe; a conſiderable number of theſe princes, and among others the ſtates of *Saxony*, were the ſecret or declared enemies of HENRY; and this furniſhed GREGORY with a favourable opportunity of extending his authority and executing his ambitious projects. This opportunity was by no means neglected; the imperious pontif took occaſion, from the diſcords that divided the empire, to inſult and depreſs its chief; he ſent, by his legates, an inſolent meſſage to the emperor at *Goſlar*, ordering him to repair immediately to *Rome*,

and

and clear himſelf, before the council that was to be aſſembled there, of the various crimes that were laid to his charge. The emperor, whoſe high ſpirit could not brook ſuch arrogant treatment, was filled with the warmeſt indignation at the view of that inſolent mandate, and, in the vehemence of his juſt reſentment, aſſembled without delay a council of the German biſhops at *Worms*, where GREGORY was charged with ſeveral flagitious practices, depoſed from the pontificate, of which he was declared unworthy, and an order iſſued out for the election of a new pontif. GREGORY oppoſed violence to violence; for no ſooner had he received, by the letters and ambaſſadors of HENRY, an account of the ſentence that had been pronounced againſt him, than, in a raging fit of vindictive frenzy, he thundered his anathemas at the head of that prince, excluded him both from the communion of the church and from the throne of his anceſtors, and impiouſly diſſolved the oath of allegiance which his ſubjects had taken to him as their lawful ſovereign. Thus war was declared on both ſides; and the civil and eccleſiaſtical powers were divided into two great factions, of which one maintained the rights of the emperor, while the other ſeconded the ambitious views of the pontif. No terms are ſufficient to expreſs the complicated ſcenes of miſery that aroſe from this deplorable ſchiſm.

XVI. At the entrance upon this war, the Swabian chiefs, with duke RODOLPH at their head, revolted againſt HENRY; and the Saxon princes, whoſe former quarrels with the emperor had been lately terminated by their defeat and ſubmiſſion [*k*],

☞ [*k*] This ſame RODOLPH had, the year before this revolt, vanquiſhed the Saxons, and obliged them to ſubmit to the emperor. Beſides the Swabian and Saxon chiefs, the dukes of *Bavaria* and *Carinthia*, the biſhops of *Wurtzbourg*, and *Worms*, and ſeveral other eminent perſonages, were concerned in this revolt.

followed their example. Theſe united powers, being ſolicited by the pope to elect a new emperor, in caſe HENRY perſiſted in his obſtinate diſobedience to the orders of the church, met at *Tribur* in the year 1076, to take counſel together concerning a matter of ſuch high importance. The reſult of their deliberations was far from being favourable to the emperor; for they agreed, that the determination of the controverſy between him and them ſhould be referred to the Roman pontif, who was to be invited for that purpoſe to a congreſs at *Augſburg* the year following, and that, in the mean time, HENRY ſhould be ſuſpended from his royal dignity, and live in the obſcurity of a private ſtation; to which rigorous conditions they alſo added, that he was to forfeit his kingdom, if, within the ſpace of a year, he was not reſtored to the boſom of the church, and delivered from the anathema that lay upon his head. When things were come to this deſperate extremity, and the faction, which was formed againſt this unfortunate prince, grew more formidable from day to day, his friends adviſed him to go into *Italy*, and implore in perſon the clemency of the pontif. The emperor yielded to this ignominious counſel, without, however, obtaining from his voyage the advantages he expected. He paſſed the *Alps* amidſt the rigour of a ſevere winter, arrived, in the month of *February* 1077, at the fortreſs of *Canuſium*, where the *ſanctimonicus* pontif reſided at that time with the young MATHILDA, counteſs of *Tuſcany*, the moſt powerful patroneſs of the church, and the moſt *tender* and affectionate of all the ſpiritual daughters of GREGORY. Here the ſuppliant prince, unmindful of his dignity, ſtood, during three days, in the open air at the entrance of this fortreſs, with his feet bare, his head uncovered, and with no other raiment but a wretched piece of coarſe woollen cloth thrown over his

body to cover his nakedneſs. The fourth day he was admitted to the preſence of the lordly pontif, who, with a good deal of difficulty, granted him the abſolution he demanded; but, as to what regarded his reſtoration to the throne, he refuſed to determine that point before the approaching congreſs, at which he made HENRY promiſe to appear, forbidding him, at the ſame time, to aſſume, during this interval, the title of king, as alſo to wear the ornaments, or to exerciſe the functions, of royalty. This opprobrious convention excited, and that juſtly, the indignation of the princes and biſhops of *Italy*, who threatened HENRY with all ſorts of evils, on account of his baſe and puſillanimous conduct, and would, undoubtedly, have depoſed him, had not he diminiſhed their reſentment by violating the convention which he had been forced to enter into with the imperious pontif, and reſuming the title and other marks of royalty which he had been obliged to lay down. On the other hand, the confederate princes of *Swabia* and *Saxony* were no ſooner informed of this unexpected change in the conduct of HENRY, than they aſſembled at *Forcheim* in the month of *March*, A. D. 1077, and unanimouſly elected RODOLPH, duke of *Swabia*, emperor in his place [*l*].

XVII. This raſh ſtep kindled a terrible flame in *Germany* and *Italy*, and involved, for a long time, thoſe unhappy lands in the calamities of war. In *Italy*, the Normans, who were maſters of the lower parts of that country, and the armies

[*l*] The ancient and modern writers of Italian and German hiſtory have given ample relations of all theſe events, though not all with the ſame fidelity and accuracy. In the brief account I have given of theſe events, I have followed the genuine ſources, and thoſe writers whoſe teſtimonies are the moſt reſpectable and ſure, ſuch as SIGONIUS, PAGI, MURATORI, MASCOVIUS, NORIS, &c. who, though they differ in ſome minute circumſtances, are yet agreed in thoſe matters that are of the moſt importance.

CENT. XI. PART II.

of the powerful and valiant MATHILDA, maintained ſucceſsfully the cauſe of GREGORY againſt the Lombards, who eſpouſed the intereſts of HENRY; while this unfortunate prince, with all the forces he could aſſemble, carried on the war in *Germany* againſt RODOLPH and the confederate princes. GREGORY, conſidering the events of war as extremely doubtful, was at firſt afraid to declare for either ſide, and therefore obſerved, during a certain time, an appearance of neutrality; but, encouraged by the battle of *Fladenheim*, in which HENRY was defeated by the Saxons, A. D. 1080, he excommunicated anew that vanquiſhed prince, and ſending a crown to the victor RODOLPH, declared him lawful king of the Germans. The injured emperor did not let this new inſult paſs unpuniſhed; ſeconded by the ſuffrages of ſeveral of the Italian and German biſhops, he depoſed GREGORY a ſecond time in a council which met at *Mentz*, and, in a ſynod that was ſoon after aſſembled at *Brixen*, in the province of *Tirol*, he raiſed to the pontificate GUIBERT, archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, who aſſumed the title of CLEMENT III., when he was conſecrated at *Rome* A. D. 1084, four years after his election.

XVIII. This election was followed ſoon after by an event which gave an advantageous turn to the affairs of HENRY; this event was a bloody battle fought upon the banks of the river *Elſter*, where RODOLPH received a mortal wound, of which he died at *Merſburg*. The emperor, having got rid of this formidable enemy, marched directly into *Italy* the following year (1081), with a deſign to cruſh GREGORY and his adherents, whoſe defeat he imagined would contribute effectually to put an end to the troubles in *Germany*. Accordingly he made ſeveral campaigns, with various ſucceſs, againſt the valiant troops of MATHILDA; and, after having raiſed twice the ſiege

of *Rome*, he resumed a third time that bold enterprise, and became, at length, master of the greatest part of that city, in the year 1084. The first step that HENRY took after this success was to place GUIBERT in the papal chair, after which he received the imperial crown from the hands of the new pontif, was saluted emperor by the Roman people, and laid close siege to the castle of *St. Angelo*, whither his mortal enemy, GREGORY, had fled for safety. He was, however, forced to raise this siege by the valour of ROBERT GUISCARD, duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, who brought GREGORY in triumph to *Rome*; but, not thinking him safe there, conducted him afterwards to *Salernum*. In this place the famous pontif ended his days the year following, A. D. 1085, and left *Europe* involved in those calamities which were the fatal effects of his boundless ambition. He was certainly a man of extensive abilities, endowed with a most enterprising genius, and an invincible firmness of mind; but it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that he was the most arrogant and audacious pontif that had hitherto sat in the papal chair. The Roman church worships him as a saint, though it is certain that he was never placed in that order by a regular canonization. PAUL V., about the beginning of the seventeenth century, appointed the twenty-fifth day of *May*, as a festival sacred to the memory of this pretended saint [*m*]; but the emperors of *Germany*, the kings of *France*, and other European princes, have always opposed the celebration of this festival, and have thus effectually prevented its becoming universal. In our times, BENEDICT XIII., zealous to secure to GREGORY the saintly

[*m*] See the *Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. ad d.* XXV *Maii*, and Jo. MABILLON, *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* VI. part II.

honours,

CENT. XI. PART II.

honours, occaſioned a conteſt, whoſe iſſue was by no means favourable to his ſuperſtitious views [*n*].

XIX. The death of GREGORY neither reſtored peace to the church, nor tranquillity to the ſtate; the tumults and diviſions which he had excited ſtill continued, and they were augmented from day to day by the ſame paſſions to which they owed their origin. CLEMENT III., who was the emperor's pontif [*o*], was maſter of the city of *Rome*, and was acknowledged as pope by a great part of *Italy*. HENRY carried on the war in *Germany* againſt the confederate princes. The faction of GREGORY, ſupported by the Normans, choſe for his ſucceſſor, in the year 1086, DIDERICK, abbot of mount *Caſſin*, who adopted the title of VICTOR III., and was conſecrated in the church of *St. Peter*, in the year 1087, when that part of the city was recovered by the Normans from the dominion of CLEMENT. But this new pontif was of a character quite oppoſite to that of GREGORY; he was modeſt and timorous, and alſo of a mild and gentle diſpoſition; and finding the papal chair beſet with factions, and the city of *Rome* under the dominion of his competitor, he retired to his monaſtery, where ſoon after he ended his days in peace. But, before his abdication, he held a council at *Benevento*, where he confirmed and renewed the laws that GREGORY had enacted for the abolition of *inveſtitures*.

[*n*] The reader will find an ample and curious account of this matter in a French book publiſhed in *Holland* in the year 1743, in three volumes, under the following title: *L'Avocat du Diable, ou Memoires Hiſtoriques et Critiques, ſur la Vie et ſur la Legende du Pape Gregoire* VII.

[*o*] The very learned Jo. GOTTL. HORNIUS engaged himſelf, in the *Miſcell. Lipſ.* tom. viii. p. 609. to publiſh the *Life of* CLEMENT III. This pontif died in the year 1100, as appears evidently from the *Chronicon Beneventanum*, publiſhed by MURATORI, in his *Antiq. Ital.* tom. i. p. 262. See alſo RUBEI *Hiſtoria Ravennat.* lib. v. p. 307.

XX. OTHO,

XX. OTHO, biſhop of *Oſtia*, and monk of *Clugni*, was, by VICTOR's recommendation, choſen to ſucceed him. This new pontif was elected at *Terracina* in the year 1088, and aſſumed the name of URBAN II. Inferior to GREGORY in fortitude and reſolution, he was, however, his equal in arrogance and pride, and ſurpaſſed him greatly in temerity and imprudence [*p*]. The commencement of his pontificate had a fair aſpect, and ſucceſs ſeemed to ſmile upon his undertakings; but upon the emperor's return into *Italy* in the year 1090, the face of affairs was totally changed; victory crowned the arms of that prince, who, by redoubled efforts of valour, defeated, at length, GUELPH, duke of *Bavaria*, and the famous MATHILDA, who were the formidable heads of the papal faction. The abominable treachery of his ſon CONRAD, who, yielding to the ſeduction of his father's enemies, revolted againſt him, and, by the advice and aſſiſtance of URBAN and MATHILDA, uſurped the kingdom of *Italy*, revived the drooping ſpirits of that faction, who hoped to ſee the laurels of the emperor blaſted by this odious and unnatural rebellion. The conſequences, however, of this event were leſs fatal to HENRY, than his enemies expected. In the mean time the troubles of *Italy* ſtill continued, nor could URBAN, with all his efforts, reduce the city of *Rome* under his lordly yoke. Finding all his ambitious meaſures diſconcerted, he aſſembled a council at *Placentia* in the year 1095, where he confirmed the laws and the anathemas of GREGORY;

[*p*] We find in the *Poſthumous Works of* MABILLON, tom. iii. p. 1. the *Life of* URBAN II., compoſed by THEOD. RUINART, with much learning and induſtry, but with too little impartiality and fidelity, as we may naturally ſuppoſe even from the name of its author, ſince it is well known that no monkiſh writer dare attempt to paint the Roman pontifs in their true colours.—See alſo, for an account of URBAN, the *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 514.

GORY.; and afterwards undertook a journey into *France*, where he held the famous council of *Clermont*, and had the pleaſure of kindling a new war againſt the infidel poſſeſſors of the holy land. In this council, inſtead of endeavouring to terminate the tumults and deſolations that the diſpute concerning *inveſtitures* had already produced, this unworthy pontif added fuel to the flame, and ſo exaſperated matters by his imprudent and arrogant proceedings, as to render an accommodation between the contending parties more difficult than ever. GREGORY, notwithſtanding his inſolence and ambition, had never carried matters ſo far as to forbid the biſhops and the reſt of the clergy to take the oath of allegiance to their reſpective ſovereigns. This rebellious prohibition was reſerved for the audacious arrogance of URBAN, who publiſhed it as a law in the council of *Clermont* [q]. After this *noble* expedition, the reſtleſs pontif returned into *Italy*, where he made himſelf maſter of the caſtle of *St. Angelo*, and ſoon after ended his days in the year 1099; he was not long ſurvived by his antagoniſt CLEMENT III., who died the following year, and thus left RAYNIER, a Benedictine monk, who was choſen ſucceſſor to URBAN, and aſſumed the name of PASCHAL II., ſole poſſeſſor of the papal chair at the concluſion of this century.

The ſtate of the monaſtic orders.

XXI. Among the eaſtern monks in this century, there happened nothing worthy of being conſigned to the records of hiſtory, while thoſe of

[q] To the fifteenth canon of this council the following words were added: *Ne epiſcopus vel ſacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciant*, i. e. *It is enacted that no biſhop or prieſt ſhall promiſe upon oath* liege obedience *to any king or any layman.* They are entirely miſtaken, who affirm that GREGORY prohibited the biſhops from taking oaths of allegiance to their reſpective ſovereigns, as Cardinal NORIS has ſufficiently demonſtrated in his *Iſtoria delle Inveſtiture*, chap. x. p. 279.

the

the weſt were concerned immediately in tranſactions of great conſequence, and which deſerve the attention of the curious reader. The weſtern monks were remarkable for their attachment to the Roman pontifs; this connexion had been long formed, and it was originally owing to the avarice and violence of both biſhops and princes, who, under various pretexts, were conſtantly encroaching upon the poſſeſſion of the monks, and thus obliged them to ſeek for ſecurity againſt theſe invaſions of their property in the protection of the popes. This protection was readily granted by the pontifs, who ſeized, with avidity, every occaſion of enlarging their authority; and the monks, in return, engaged themſelves to pay an annual tribute to their ghoſtly patrons. But in this century things were carried ſtill farther; and the pontifs, more eſpecially GREGORY VII., who was eagerly bent upon humbling the biſhops, and transferring their privileges to the Roman ſee, enlarged their juriſdiction over the monks at the expence of the epiſcopal order. They adviſed and exhorted the monks to withdraw themſelves and their poſſeſſions from the juriſdiction of the biſhops, and to place both under the inſpection and dominion of St. PETER [*r*]. Hence it happened that, from the time of GREGORY, the number of monaſteries that had received *immunities*, both from the temporal authority of the ſovereign and the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the biſhops, were multiplied beyond meaſure throughout all *Europe*, and the rights of princes, toge-

[*r*] A ſpecimen of this may be ſeen in the ſeventh Epiſtle of GREGORY, in which he reduces the monks of *Redon* under the juriſdiction of the Roman ſee by a mandate conceived in terms that had never been uſed before his time; ſee MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. i. p. 204. We may add to this ſeveral like mandates of URBAN II. and the ſucceeding pontifs, which are to be found in the collection now cited, and in others of that kind.

ther

ther with the intereſts and privileges of the epiſcopal order, were violated and trampled upon, or rather ingroſſed; to ſwell the growing deſpotiſm of the all-graſping pontifs [*s*].

Their corruption.

XXII. All the writers of this age complain of the ignorance, licentiouſneſs, frauds, debaucheries, diſſenſions, and enormities, that diſhonoured by far the greateſt part of the monaſtic orders, not to mention the numerous marks of their diſſolution and impiety that have been handed down to our times [*t*]. However aſtoniſhed we may be at ſuch horrid irregularities among a ſet of men whoſe deſtination was ſo ſacred, and whoſe profeſſion was ſo auſtere, we ſhall ſtill be more ſurpriſed to learn that this degenerate order, ſo far from loſing aught of their influence and credit on account of their licentiouſneſs, were promoted, on the contrary, to the higheſt eccleſiaſtical dignities, and beheld their opulence and authority increaſing from day to day. Our ſurpriſe, indeed, will be diminiſhed, when we conſider the groſs ignorance and ſuperſtition, and the unbounded licentiouſneſs and corruption of manners, that reigned in this century among all ranks and orders of men [*u*]. Ignorance and corruption pervert

[*s*] There is not, perhaps, in *Germany*, one ſingle inſtance, of this pernicious *immunity* before the time of GREGORY VII.

[*t*] See Jo. LAUNOY, *Aſſert. in privileg. S. Medardi*, cap. xxvi. § vi. opp. tom. iii. part II. p. 499. and SIMON, *Biblioth. Critique*, tom. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 331.

[*u*] For an account of the aſtoniſhing corruption of this age, ſee BLONDEL, *De Formula regnante Chriſto*, p. 14.—BOULAINVILLIERS, *De l'Origine et des Droits de la Nobleſſe* in MOLET's *Memoires de Litterature et d'Hiſtoire*, tom. ix. part I. p. 63. The corruption and violence that reigned with impunity in this horrid age, gave occaſion to the inſtitutions of chivalry or knighthood, in conſequence of which a certain ſet of equeſtrian heroes undertook the defence of the poor and feeble, and particularly of the fair ſex, againſt the inſults of powerful oppreſſors and raviſhers. This order of knights-errant was certainly of great uſe in theſe miſerable times, when the

pervert the taſte and judgment of even thoſe who are not void of natural ſagacity, and often prevent their being ſhocked at the greateſt inconſiſtencies. 'Amidſt this general depravation of ſentiments and conduct, amidſt the flagitious crimes that were daily perpetrated, not only by the laity, but alſo by the various orders of the clergy, both *ſecular* and *regular*, all ſuch as reſpected the common rules of decency, or preſerved in their external demeanor the leaſt appearance of piety and virtue, were looked upon as ſaints of the higheſt rank, and conſidered as the peculiar favourites of heaven. This circumſtance was, no doubt, favourable to many of the monks, who were leſs profligate than the reſt of their order, and might contribute more or leſs to ſupport the credit of the whole body. Beſides, it often happened, that princes, dukes, knights, and generals, whoſe days had been conſumed in debauchery and crimes, and diſtinguiſhed by nothing but the violent exploits of unbridled luſt, cruelty, and avarice, felt at the approach of old age, or death, the inexpreſſible anguiſh of a wounded conſcience, and the gloomy apprehenſions and terrors it excites. In this dreadful condition, what was their reſource? What were the means by which they hoped to diſarm the uplifted hand of divine juſtice, and render the governor of the world propitious? They purchaſed at an enormous price the prayers of the monks to ſcreen them from judgment, and devoted to God and to the ſaints a large portion of the fruits of their rapine, or entered themſelves into the monaſtic order, and bequeathed their poſſeſſions to their new brethren.

the majeſty of laws and government was fallen into contempt, and they who bore the title of ſovereigns and magiſtrates, had neither reſolution nor power to maintain their authority, or to perform the duties of their ſtations.

And

And thus it was that monkery received perpetually new acceſſions of opulence and credit.

The monks of *Clugni*.

XXIII. The monks of *Clugni* in *France* ſurpaſſed all the other religious orders in the renown they had acquired, from a prevailing opinion of their eminent ſanctity and virtue. Hence their diſcipline was univerſally reſpected, and hence alſo their rules were adopted by the founders of new monaſteries, and the reformers of thoſe that were in a ſtate of decline. Theſe famous monks aroſe, by degrees, to the very higheſt ſummit of worldly proſperity, by the preſents which they received from all quarters; and their power and credit grew, with their opulence, to ſuch a height, that, towards the concluſion of this century, they were formed into a ſeparate ſociety, which ſtill ſubſiſts under the title of the *order*, or *congregation of Clugni* [*w*]. And no ſooner were they thus eſtabliſhed, than they extended their ſpiritual dominion on all ſides, reducing, under their juriſdiction, all the monaſteries which they had reformed by their counſels, and engaged to adopt their religious diſcipline. The famous HUGO, ſixth abbot of *Clugni*, who was in high credit at the court of *Rome*, and had acquired the peculiar protection and eſteem of ſeveral princes, laboured, with ſuch ſucceſs, in extending the power and juriſdiction of his order, that, before the end of this century, he ſaw himſelf at the head of five-and-thirty of the principal monaſteries in *France*, beſides a conſiderable number of ſmaller convents that acknowledged him as their chief. Many other religious ſocieties, though they refuſed en-

[*w*] For a particular account of the rapid and monſtrous ſtrides which the order of *Clugni* made to opulence and dominion, ſee STEPH. BALUZIUS, *Miſcellan.* tom. v. p. 343. and tom. vi. p. 436. as alſo MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. *paſſim*.

tering

tering into this new order, and continued to chooſe their reſpective governors, yet ſhewed ſuch reſpect for the *abbot* of *Clugni*, or the *arch-abbot*, as he ſtyled himſelf, that they regarded him as their ſpiritual chief [x]. This enormous augmentation of opulence and authority was, however, fruitful of many evils; it increaſed the arrogance of theſe aſpiring monks, and contributed much to the propagation of the ſeveral vices that diſhonoured the religious ſocieties of this licentious and ſuperſtitious age. The monks of *Clugni* degenerated ſoon from their primitive ſanctity, and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, were diſtinguiſhed by nothing but the peculiarities of their diſcipline from the reſt of the monaſtic orders.

XXIV. The example of theſe monks excited ſeveral pious men to erect particular monaſtic fraternities, or congregations, like that of *Clugni*; the conſequence of which was, that the Benedictine order, which had been hitherto one great and univerſal body, was now divided into ſeparate ſocieties, which, though they were ſubject to one general rule, yet differed from each other in various circumſtances, both of their diſcipline and manner of living; and rendered their diviſion ſtill more conſpicuous by reciprocal exertions of animoſity and hatred. In the year 1023, ROMUALD, an Italian fanatic, retired to *Camaldoli* [y], on the mount *Apennine*, and, in that ſolitary retreat, founded the order, or *congregation of the Camaldolites*, which ſtill remains in a flouriſhing ſtate, particularly in *Italy*. His followers were diſtinguiſhed into two claſſes, of which the one were Cœnobites, and the other Eremites. Both ob-

[x] MABILLON, *Præfat. ad Sæc.* v. *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. xxvi.—*Hiſt. Generale de Bourgogne par les Moines Benedictins*, tom. i. p. 151. publiſhed at *Paris* in folio, in the year 1739.—*Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 470.

[y] Otherwiſe called *Campo Malduli*.

ſerved a ſevere diſcipline; but the Cœnobites had degenerated much from their primitive auſterity [z].

Some time after this, GUALBERT, a native of *Florence*, founded at *Val-Ombroſo*, ſituated in the *Apennines*, a congregation of Benedictine monks, who, in a ſhort ſpace of time, propagated their diſcipline in ſeveral parts of *Italy* [a]. To theſe two Italian monaſteries we may add that of *Hirſauge* in *Germany* [b], erected by WILLIAM, an eminent abbot, who had reformed many ancient convents, and was the founder of ſeveral new eſtabliſhments. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the monaſtery of *Hirſauge* was rather a branch of the congregation of *Clugni*, whoſe laws and manner of living it had adopted, than a new fraternity.

Ciſtertian monks.

XXV. Towards the concluſion of this century [c], ROBERT, abbot of *Moleme* in *Burgundy*, having employed, in vain, his moſt zealous efforts to revive the decaying piety and diſcipline

[z] The writers, who have given any ſatisfactory accounts of the order of the *Camaldolites*, are enumerated by Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 895.—Add to theſe ROMUALDI *Vita, in Actis Sanctor. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 101. and in MABILLON's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part I. p. 247.—HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 236.—MABILLON, *Annal. Ord. Bened.* tom. v. p. 261.—MAGNOALDI ZEIGELBAVER, *Centifolium Camaldulenſe, ſive Notitia Scriptor. Camaldulenſium*, publiſhed at *Venice* in the year 1750.

[a] See the life of GUALBERT in MABILLON's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part II. p. 273. HELYOT. *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 298. Many intereſting circumſtances relating to the hiſtory of this order have been publiſhed by the learned LAMI, in the *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, publiſhed at *Florence*, tom. ii. p. 238. as alſo p. 272. 279. where the ancient laws of the order are enumerated; ſee alſo tom. iii. of the ſame work, p. 177. 212.

[b] See MABILLON, *Acta Sanct. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part II. p. 716.—HELYOT. *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 332.

[c] In the year 1098.

of

of his convent, and to oblige his monks to observe, with more exactneſs, the rule of St. BENEDICT, retired, with about twenty monks, who had not been infected with the diſſolute turn of their brethren, to a place called *Citeaux*, in the dioceſe of *Chalons*. In this retreat, which was at that time a miſerable deſert, covered on all ſides with brambles and thorns, but which bears, at preſent, a quite different aſpect, ROBERT laid the foundations of the famous order, or *congregation of Ciſtertians*, which, like that of *Clugni*, made a moſt rapid and aſtoniſhing progreſs, was propagated through the greateſt part of *Europe* in the following century, and was not only enriched with the moſt liberal and ſplendid donations, but alſo acquired the form and privileges of a ſpiritual republic, and exerciſed a ſort of dominion over all the monaſtic orders [*d*]. The great and fundamental law of this new fraternity, was the rule of St. BENEDICT, which was to be ſolemnly and rigorouſly obſerved; to this were added ſeveral other inſtitutions and injunctions, which were deſigned to maintain the authority of this rule, to enſure its obſervance, and to defend it againſt the dangerous effects of opulence, and the reſtleſs efforts of human corruption to render the beſt eſtabliſhments imperfect. Theſe injunctions were exceſſively auſtere, grievous to nature, but pious and laudable in the eſteem of a ſuperſtitious age. They did not, however, ſecure the ſanctity of this holy congregation; ſince the ſeducing charms of opulence, that corrupted the monks of *Clugni* much ſooner than was expected, produced the ſame effect among the Ciſtertians, whoſe zeal, in the rigor-

☞ [*d*] In about an hundred years after its firſt eſtabliſhment, this order boaſted of 1800 abbies, and was become ſo powerful, that it governed almoſt all *Europe*, both in ſpirituals and temporals.

ous obſervance of their rule, began gradually to diminiſh, and who, in proceſs of time, grew as negligent and diſſolute as the reſt of the Benedictines [*e*].

New monaſtic orders.

XXVI. Beſides theſe convents, that were founded upon the principles, and might be conſidered as branches, of the Benedictine order, ſeveral other monaſtic ſocieties were formed, which were diſtinguiſhed by peculiar laws, and by rules of diſcipline and obedience, which they had drawn up for themſelves. To many of thoſe gloomy and fanatical monks, whoſe auſterity was rather the fruit of a bad habit of body, than the reſult of a religious principle, the rule of BENEDICT appeared too mild; to others it ſeemed incomplete and defective, and not ſufficiently accommodated to the exerciſe of the various duties we owe to the Supreme Being. Hence STEPHEN, a nobleman of *Auvergne* (who is called by ſome STEPHEN *de Muret*, from the place where he firſt erected the convent of his order) obtained, in the year 1073, from GREGORY VII., the privilege of inſtituting a new ſpecies of monaſtic diſcipline. His firſt deſign was to ſubject his fraternity to the rule of St. BENEDICT; but he changed his intention, and compoſed himſelf the body of laws, which was to be their rule of life, piety, and manners. In theſe laws there were many injunctions, that ſhewed the exceſſive au-

[*e*] The principal hiſtorian of the *Ciſtertian Order*, is ANG. MANRIQUES, whoſe *Annales Ciſtertienſes*, an ample and learned work, were publiſhed in four volumes, folio, at *Lyons*, in the year 1642. After him we may place PIERE LE NAIN, whoſe *Eſſai de l' Hiſtoire de l' Ordre des Citeaux*, was printed in the year 1696, at *Paris*, in nine volumes, in 8vo. The other hiſtorians, who have given accounts of this famous order, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1066. Add to theſe HELYOT's *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 341. and MABILLON, who, in the fifth and ſixth volumes of his *Annales Benedictini*, has given a learned and accurate account of the origin and progreſs of the Ciſtertians.

ſterity of their author. Poverty and obedience were the two great points which he inculcated with the warmeſt zeal, and all his regulations were directed to promote and ſecure them in this new eſtabliſhment; for this purpoſe it was ſolemnly enacted, that the monks ſhould poſſeſs no lands beyond the limits of their convent; that the uſe of fleſh ſhould be allowed to none, not even to the ſick and infirm; and that none ſhould be permitted to keep cattle, that they might not be expoſed to the temptation of violating their frugal regimen. To theſe ſevere precepts many others of equal rigour were added; for this gloomy legiſlator impoſed upon his fraternity the ſolemn obſervance of a profound and uninterrupted ſilence, and inſiſted ſo much upon the importance and neceſſity of ſolitude, that none but a few perſons of the higheſt eminence and authority were permitted to paſs the threſhold of his monaſtery. He prohibited all intercourſe with the female ſex, and indeed excluded his order from all the comforts and enjoyments of life. His followers were divided into two claſſes, of which the one comprehended the *clerks*, and the other, what he called the *converted brethren*. The former were totally abſorbed in the contemplation of divine things, while the latter were charged with the care and adminiſtration of whatever related to the concerns and neceſſities of a preſent life. Such were the principal circumſtances of the new inſtitution founded by STEPHEN, which aroſe to the higheſt pitch of renown in this and the following century, and was regarded with the moſt profound veneration as long as its laws and diſcipline were obſerved; but two things contributed to its decline, and at length brought on its ruin; the firſt was, the violent conteſt which aroſe between the *clerks* and the *converts*, on account of the pre-eminence which the latter pre-

tended over the former; and the ſecond was, the gradual diminution of the rigour and auſterity of STEPHEN's rule, which was ſoftened and mitigated from time to time, both by the heads of the order, and by the Roman pontifs. This once famous monaſtic ſociety was diſtinguiſhed by the title of the *Order of Grandmontains*, as *Muret*, where they were firſt eſtabliſhed, was ſituated near *Grammont*, in the province of *Limoges* [*f*].

The order of the Carthuſians.

XXVII. In the year 1084 [*g*], was inſtituted the famous order of Carthuſians, ſo called from *Chartreux*, a diſmal and wild ſpot of ground near *Grenoble* in *Daupkine*, ſurrounded with barren mountains and craggy rocks. The founder of this monaſtic ſociety, which ſurpaſſed all the reſt in the extravagant auſterity of their manners and diſcipline, was BRUNO, a native of *Colegn*, and canon of the cathedral of *Rheims* in *France*. This zealous eccleſiaſtic, who had neither power to reform, nor patience to bear, the diſſolute manners of his archbiſhop MANASSE, retired from his church with ſix of his companions, and, having obtained the permiſſion of HUGH, biſhop of *Grenoble*, fixed his reſidence in the miſerable deſert already mentioned [*h*]. He adopted at firſt the

[*f*] The origin of this order is related by BERNARD GUIDON, whoſe treatiſe upon that ſubject is publiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Manuſcriptorum*, PHIL. LABBEI, tom. ii. p. 275. For an account of the hiſtory of this celebrated ſociety, ſee Jo. MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. p. 65. ſ. p. 99. tom. vi. p. 116. and *Præf. ad Actor. SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part II. p. 34.—HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 409.—*Gallia Chriſt. Monachor. Bened.* tom. ii. p. 645.—BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionenſ.* tom. i. p. 158. *et Miſcellanea*, tom. vii. p. 486.—☞ The life and ghoſtly exploits of STEPHEN, the founder of this order, are recorded in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Febr.* p. 199.

[*g*] Some place the inſtitution of this order in the year 1080, and others in the year 1086.

[*h*] The learned FABRICIUS mentions, in his *Bibl. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 784. ſeveral writers who have compoſed the

the rule of St. BENEDICT, to which he added a considerable number of severe and rigorous precepts; his successors, however, went still farther, and imposed upon the Carthusians new laws, much more intolerable than those of their founder, laws which inculcated the highest degrees of austerity that the most gloomy imagination could invent [*i*]. And yet, notwithstanding all this, it is remarkable, that no monastic society degenerated so little from the severity of their primitive institution and discipline as this of the Carthusians. The progress of their order was indeed less rapid, and their influence less extensive in

history of BRUNO and his order, but his enumeration is incomplete; since there are yet extant many histories of the Carthusians, that have escaped his notice. See INNOCENT. MASSONI *Annales Carthusian.* published in the year 1687.—PETRI ORLANDI *Chronicon Carthusianum*, and the elegant, though imperfect, history of the order in question, which is to be found in HELYOT's *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 366. Many important illustrations on the nature and laws of this famous society have been published by MABILLON, in his *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 638. 683. A particular and accurate account of BRUNO has been given by the Benedictine monks in their *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 233.; but a yet more ample one will be undoubtedly given by the compilers of the *Acta Sanctorum*, when they shall have carried on their work to the 6th of *October*, which is the festival consecrated to the memory of BRUNO. It was a current report in ancient times, that the occasion of BRUNO's retreat was the miraculous restoration of a certain priest to life, who, while the funeral service was performing, raised himself up and said, *By the just judgment of God I am damned*, and then expired anew. This story is looked upon as fabulous by the most respectable writers even of the Roman church, especially since it has been refuted by LAUNOY, in his treatise *De causa Secessus Brunonis in Desertum.* Nor does it seem to preserve its credit among the Carthusians, who are more interested than others in this pretended miracle. Such of them, at least, as affirm it, do it with a good deal of modesty and diffidence. The arguments on both sides are candidly and accurately enumerated by CÆS. EGASS. DU BOULAY, in his *Histor. Academ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 467.

[*i*] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* vi. part II. *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. 37.

the different countries of *Europe*, than the progreſs and influence of thoſe monaſtic eſtabliſhments, whoſe laws were leſs rigorous, and whoſe manners were leſs auſtere. It was a long time before the tender ſex could be engaged to ſubmit to the ſavage rules of this melancholy inſtitution; nor had the Carthuſian order ever reaſon to boaſt of a multitude of females ſubjected to its juriſdiction; it was too forbidding to captivate a ſex, which, though ſuſceptible of the ſeductions of enthuſiaſm, is of a frame too delicate to ſupport the ſeverities of a rigorous ſelf-denial [*k*].

The order of St. Anthony of *Vienne*.

XXVIII. Towards the concluſion of this century [*l*], the *order* of St. ANTHONY of *Vienne* in *Dauphine*, was inſtituted for the relief and ſupport of ſuch as were ſeized with grievous diſorders, and particularly with the diſeaſe called *St. Anthony's fire*. All who were infected with that peſtilential diſorder repaired to a cell built near *Vienne* by the Benedictine monks of *Grammont*, in which the body of St. ANTHONY was ſaid to re-

[*k*] The Carthuſian nuns have not ſufficiently attracted the attention of the authors who have written concerning this famous order; nay, ſeveral writers have gone ſo far as to maintain, that there was not in this order a ſingle convent of nuns. This notion, however, is highly erroneous; as there were formerly ſeveral convents of Carthuſian virgins, of which indeed the greateſt part have not ſubſiſted to our times. In the year 1368, there was an extraordinary law paſſed, by which the eſtabliſhment of any more female Carthuſian convents was expreſsly prohibited. Hence there remain only five at this day; four in *France*, and one in *Bruges* in *Flanders*. See the *Varietés Hiſtoriques Phyſiques et Litteraires*, tom. i. p. 80. publiſhed at *Paris* in 8vo, in the year 1752. Certain it is, that the rigorous diſcipline of the Carthuſians is quite inconſiſtent with the delicacy and tenderneſs of the female ſex; and therefore, in the few female convents of that order that ſtill ſubſiſt, the auſterity of that diſcipline has been diminiſhed, as well from neceſſity, as from humanity and wiſdom; it was more particularly found neceſſary to abrogate thoſe ſevere injunctions of *ſilence* and *ſolitude*, that are ſo little adapted to the known character and genius of the ſex.

[*l*] In the year 1095.

poſe.

poſe, that, by the prayers and interceſſions of this eminent ſaint, they might be miraculouſly healed. GASTON, an opulent nobleman of *Vienne*, and his ſon GUERIN, pretended to have experienced, in their complete recovery, the marvellous efficacy of St. ANTHONY's interceſſion, and, in conſequence thereof, devoted themſelves and their poſſeſſions, from a principle of pious gratitude, to the ſervice of St. ANTHONY, and to the performance of generous and charitable offices towards all ſuch as were afflicted with the miſeries of poverty and ſickneſs. Their example was followed, at firſt, but by eight perſons; their community, however, was afterwards conſiderably augmented. They were not bound by particular vows like the other monaſtic orders, but were conſecrated, in general, to the ſervice of God, and lived under the juriſdiction of the monks of *Grammont*. In proceſs of time, growing opulent and powerful by the multitude of pious donations they received from all parts, they withdrew themſelves from the dominion of the Benedictines, propagated their order in various countries, and, at length, obtained, in the year 1297, from BONIFACE VIII. the dignity and privileges of an independent congregation, under the rule of St. AUGUSTIN [*m*].

The order of canons.

XXIX. The licentiouſneſs and corruption, that had infected all the other ranks and orders of the clergy, were alſo remarkable among the *canons*, which was a middle ſort of order between the monks and ſecular prieſts, and whoſe firſt eſtabliſh-

[*m*] See the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Januarii*, p. 160.—HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 108.—GABR. PENOTT. *Hiſtor. Canonicorum regular.* lib. ii. cap. 70.—JO. ERH. KAPII *Diſſ. de fratribus S. Anton.* publiſhed at *Leipſick*, in the year 1737.—For an account of the preſent ſtate of the principal hoſpital or reſidence of this order, where the abbot remains, ſee MARTENE and DURAND, *Voyage Litér. de deux Benedictins de la Congreg. de St. Maur.* tom. i. p. 260.

ment

ment was in the eighth century. In certain provinces of *Europe*, the *canons* were corrupted to a very high degree, and ſurpaſſed, in the ſcandalous diſſolution of their manners, all the other eccleſiaſtical and monaſtic orders. Hence ſeveral pious and virtuous perſons exerted their zeal for the reformation of this degenerate body; ſome pontifs appeared in this good cauſe, and more eſpecially NICOLAS II., who, in a council held at *Rome* in the year 1059, abrogated the ancient rule of the canons, which had been drawn up at *Aix-la-Chapelle*, and ſubſtituted another in its place [*n*]. Theſe laudable attempts were attended with conſiderable ſucceſs, and a much better rule of diſcipline was eſtabliſhed in almoſt all the canonical orders, than that which had been formerly in uſe. It was not, however, poſſible to regulate them all upon the ſame footing, and to ſubject them to the ſame degree of reformation and diſcipline; nor indeed was this neceſſary. Accordingly a certain number of theſe canonical colleges were erected into communities, the reſpective members of which had one common dwelling, and a common table, which was the point chiefly inſiſted upon by the pontifs, as this alone was ſufficient to prevent the *canons* from entering into the bonds of matrimony. It did not, however, exclude them from the poſſeſſion or enjoyment of private property; for they reſerved to themſelves the right of appropriating to their own uſe the fruits and revenues of their benefices, and of employing them as they thought expedient. Other canonical congregations ſubjected themſelves to a rule of life leſs agreeable and commodious, in conſe-

[*n*] This decree of NICOLAS II., by which the primitive rule of the *canons* was changed, is publiſhed by MABILLON among the papers, which ſerve as proofs to the 4th volume of his *Annales Bened.* and alſo in the *Annals* themſelves. See tom. iv. *Annal. Bened.* p. 748. as alſo lib. lxi. § xxxv. p. 586.

quence

quence of the zealous exhortations of Ivo or IVES bishop of *Chartres*, renouncing all their worldly possessions and prospects, all private property, and living in a manner that resembled the austerity of the monastic orders. Hence arose the well-known distinction between the *secular* and the *regular canons*; the former of which observed the decree of NICOLAS II., while the latter, more prone to mortification and self-denial, complied with the directions and jurisdictions of Ivo; and as this austere prelate imitated St. AUGUSTIN [o] in the manner of regulating the conduct of his clergy, his *canons* were called, by many, *the regular canons of St. Augustin* [p].

XXX. The

☞ [o] St. AUGUSTIN committed to writing no particular rule for his clergy; but his manner of ruling them may be learned from several passages in his *Epistles*.

[p] See MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. iv. p. 586. *et Opera Posthuma*, tom. ii. p. 102. 115.—HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 11.—LUD. THOMASSINI *Disciplina Ecclesiæ circa Beneficia*, tom. i. part I. l. iii. c. xi. p. 657.—MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 257.—In the *Gallia Christiana* of the Benedictine monks, we find frequent mention made both of this reformation of the *canons*, and also of their division into *seculars* and *regulars*. The *regular canons* are much displeased with all the accounts that render the origin of their community so recent; they are extremely ambitious of appearing with the venerable character of an ancient establishment, and therefore trace back their first rise, through the darkness of the remotest ages, to CHRIST himself, or at least to St. AUGUSTIN. But the arguments and testimonies, by which they pretend to support this imagined antiquity of their order, are a proof of the weakness of their cause and of the vanity of their pretensions, and are not, therefore, worthy of a serious refutation. It is true, the title of *canons* is, undoubtedly, of much more ancient date, than the eleventh century, but not as applied to a particular order or institution, for at its first rise it was used in a very vague general sense (See CLAUD. DE VERT, *Explications des Ceremonies de la Messe*, tom. i. p. 58.) and therefore the mere existence of the title proves nothing. At the same time, it is evident, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that we find not the least mention made of the division of the *canons* into *regular* and *secular* before the eleventh

CENT. XI. PART II.

XXX. The moſt eminent Greek writers in this century, were,

The principal Greek writers.

THEOPHANES *Cerameus*, i. e. the *potter*, of whom there is yet extant a volume of *Homilies*, that are not altogether contemptible;

NILUS DOXOPATRIUS, who was remarkable for his knowledge in matters relating to eccleſiaſtical polity;

NICETAS PECTORATUS, who was a moſt ſtrenuous defender of the religious ſentiments and cuſtoms of the Greek church;

MICHAEL PSELLUS, whoſe vaſt progreſs in various kinds of learning and ſcience procured him a moſt diſtinguiſhed and ſhining reputation;

MICHAEL CERULARIUS, biſhop or patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who imprudently revived the controverſy between the Greeks and Latins, which had been for ſome time happily ſuſpended;

eleventh century. And it is equally certain, that thoſe *canons*, who had nothing in *common* but their *dwelling* and *table*, were called *ſecular*; while thoſe who had diveſted themſelves of all private property, and had every thing, without exception, in common with their fraternity, were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *regular canons*.

☞ To Dr. MOSHEIM's account of the *canons*, it may not be improper to add a few words concerning their introduction into *England*, and their progreſs and eſtabliſhment among us. The *order of regular canons of St. Auguſtin* was brought into *England* by ADELWALD, confeſſor to HENRY I., who firſt erected a priory of his order at *Noſtel* in *Yorkſhire*, and had influence enough to have the church of *Carliſle* converted into an epiſcopal ſee, and given to regular canons inveſted with the privilege of chuſing their biſhop. This order was ſingularly favoured and protected by HENRY I., who gave them, in the year 1107, the priory of *Dunſtable*, and by queen MAUD, who erected for them, the year following, the priory of the *Holy Trinity* in *London*, the prior of which was always one of the twenty-four aldermen. They increaſed ſo prodigiouſly, that, beſides the noble priory of *Merton*, which was founded for them, in the year 1117, by GILBERT, an earl of the Norman blood, they had, under the reign of EDWARD I. fifty-three priories, as appears by the catalogue preſented to that prince, when he obliged all the monaſteries to receive his protection, and to acknowledge his juriſdiction.

SIMEON,

SIMEON, the Younger, author of a book of *Meditations on the Duties of the Chriſtian Life*, which is yet extant;

THEOPHYLACT, a Bulgarian, whoſe illuſtrations of the ſacred writings were received with univerſal approbation and eſteem [*q*].

Latin writers.

XXXI. The writers, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves moſt among the Latins, were they that follow:

FULBERT, biſhop of *Chartres*, eminent for his love of letters, and his zeal for the education of youth, as alſo for various compoſitions, particularly his epiſtles, and famous for his exceſſive and enthuſiaſtic attachment to the Virgin MARY [*r*].

HUMBERT, a Cardinal of the Roman church, who far ſurpaſſed all the Latins, both in the vehemence and learning which appeared in his controverſial writings againſt the Greeks [*s*].

PETRUS DAMIANUS, who, on account of his genius, candour, probity, and various erudition, deſerves to be ranked among the moſt learned and eſtimable writers of this century; though he was not altogether untainted with the reigning prejudices and defects of the times [*t*];

MARIANUS SCOTUS, whoſe *Chronicle*, with ſeveral other compoſitions, is yet extant;

ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, a man of great genius and ſubtilty, deeply verſed in the dialectics of this age, and moſt illuſtriouſly diſ-

[*q*] For a more ample account of theſe Greek writers, the reader may conſult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

[*r*] For a farther account of this eminent man, ſee the *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 261.

[*s*] See MARTENE, *Theſaurus Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 629.—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 527.

[*t*] See the *Acta Sanctor. Febr.* tom. iii. p. 406.—*General Dictionary*, at the article DAMIEN.—CASIM. OUDINI *Diſſ.* in tom. ii. *Comm. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* p. 686.

tinguiſhed

tinguiſhed by his profound and extraordinary knowledge in theology [*u*].

LANFRANC, alſo archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his *Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, as alſo by ſeveral other productions [*w*], which, conſidering the age in which he lived, diſcover an uncommon meaſure of ſagacity and erudition [*x*];

BRUNO of mount *Coſſin*, and the other famous eccleſiaſtic of that name, who founded the monaſtery of the Carthuſians;

IVO, biſhop of *Chartres*, who was ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed by his zeal and activity in maintaining the rights and privileges of the church;

HILDEBERT, archbiſhop of *Tours*, who was a philoſopher and a poet, as well as a divine, without being either eminent or contemptible in any of theſe characters [*y*]; but, upon the whole, a man of conſiderable learning and capacity;

GREGORY VII., that imperious and arrogant pontif, of whom we have ſeveral productions, beſide his *Letters*.

[*u*] See the *Hiſtor. Litter. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 398.—RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſt. d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. p. 65. 166. *de l'ed. en* 4to.—COLONIA, *Hiſt. Litter. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 210.—We have already given a more ample account of the eminent abilities and learned productions of ANSELM.

☞ [*w*] Among theſe productions we may reckon LANFRANC's *Letters* to pope ALEXANDER II., to HILDEBRAND, while archdeacon of *Rome*, and to ſeveral biſhops in *England* and *Normandy*; as alſo *A Commentary upon the Pſalms*; *A Treatiſe concerning Confeſſion*; *An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, which is not extant; and, *A remarkable Diſſertation concerning the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*. In this laſt performance, LANFRANC endeavours to prove, againſt BERENGER, the reality of a *corporal preſence* in the euchariſt; though it is manifeſt, that this opinion was not the doctrine of the church of *England*, in the concluſion of the tenth, or the commencement of the following century. See COLLIER's *Eccleſ. Hiſtory of Great Britain*, vol. i. p. 260. 263.

[*x*] *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 260.

[*y*] The Benedictine monks publiſhed, in folio, at *Paris*, in the year 1708, the *Works* of HILDEBERT, illuſtrated by the obſervations of BEAUGENDRE.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The ſtate of religion.

I. IT is not neceſſary to draw at full length the hideous portrait of the religion of this age. It may eaſily be imagined, that its features were full of deformity, when we conſider that its guardians were equally deſtitute of knowledge and virtue, and that the heads and rulers of the Chriſtian church, inſtead of exhibiting models of piety, held forth in their conduct ſcandalous examples of the moſt flagitious crimes. The people were ſunk in the groſſeſt ſuperſtition; and employed all their zeal in the worſhip of images and relics, and in the performance of a trifling round of ceremonies, which were impoſed upon them by the tyranny of a deſpotic prieſthood. The more learned, 'tis true, retained ſtill ſome notions of the truth, which, however, they obſcured and corrupted by a wretched mixture of opinions and precepts, of which ſome were ludicrous, others pernicious, and the moſt of them equally deſtitute of truth and utility. There were, no doubt, in ſeveral places, judicious and pious men, who would have willingly lent a ſupporting hand to the declining cauſe of true religion; but the violent prejudices of a barbarous age rendered all ſuch attempts not only dangerous, but even deſperate; and thoſe choſen ſpirits, who had eſcaped the general contagion, lay too much concealed, and had therefore too little influence, to combat, with ſucceſs, the formidable patrons of impiety and ſuperſtition, who were extremely numerous, in all ranks and orders, from the throne to the cottage.

II. Not-

CENT. XI. PART II.

Witneſſes of the truth.

II. Notwithſtanding all this we find, from the time of GREGORY VII., ſeveral proofs of the zealous efforts of thoſe, who are generally called, by the proteſtants, the *witneſſes of the truth*; by whom are meant, ſuch pious and judicious Chriſtians, as adhered to the pure religion of the goſpel, and remained uncorrupted amidſt the growth of ſuperſtition; who deplored the miſerable ſtate to which Chriſtianity was reduced, by the alteration of its divine doctrines, and the vices of its profligate miniſters; who oppoſed, with vigour, the tyrannic ambition both of the lordly pontif and the aſpiring biſhops; and in ſome provinces privately, in others openly, attempted the reformation of a corrupt and idolatrous church, and of a barbarous and ſuperſtitious age. This was, indeed, bearing witneſs to the truth in the nobleſt manner, and it was principally in *Italy* and *France* that the marks of this heroic piety were exhibited. [☞ Nor is it at all ſurpriſing, that the reigning ſuperſtition of the times met with this oppoſition; it is aſtoniſhing, on the contrary, that this oppoſition was not much greater and more univerſal, and that millions of Chriſtians ſuffered themſelves to be hoodwinked with ſuch a tame ſubmiſſion, and cloſed their eyes upon the light with ſo little reluctance.] For notwithſtanding the darkneſs of the times, and the general ignorance of the true religion, that prevailed in all ranks and orders, yet the very fragments of the goſpel (if we may uſe that term) which were ſtill read and explained to the people, were ſufficient, at leaſt, to convince the moſt ſtupid and illiterate, that the religion, which was now impoſed upon them, was not the true religion of JESUS; that the diſcourſes, the lives, and morals of the clergy were directly oppoſite to what the divine Saviour required of his diſciples, and to the rules he had laid down for the direction of their conduct; that

that the pontifs and biſhops abuſed, in a ſcandalous manner, their power and opulence; and that the favour of God, and the ſalvation exhibited in his bleſſed goſpel, were not to be obtained by performing a round of external ceremonies, by pompous donations to churches and prieſts, or by founding and enriching monaſteries, but by real ſanctity of heart and manners. CENT. XI. PART II.

III. It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that they who undertook, with ſuch zeal and ardour, the reformation of the church, were not, for the moſt part, equal to this arduous and important enterpriſe, and that, by avoiding, with more vehemence than circumſpection, certain abuſes and defects, they ruſhed unhappily into the oppoſite extremes. They all perceived the abominable nature of thoſe inventions with which ſuperſtition had disfigured the religion of JESUS; but they had alſo loſt ſight of the true nature and genius of that celeſtial religion, that lay thus disfigured in the hands of a ſuperſtitious and diſſolute prieſthood. They were ſhocked at the abſurdities of the eſtabliſhed worſhip; but few of them were ſufficiently acquainted with the ſublime precepts and doctrines of genuine Chriſtianity, to ſubſtitute in the place of this ſuperſtitious worſhip a rational ſervice. Hence their attempts of reformation, even where they were ſucceſsful, were extremely imperfect, and produced little more than a motley mixture of truth and falſehood, of wiſdom and indiſcretion; of which we might allege a multitude of examples. Obſerving, for inſtance, that the corruption and licentiouſneſs of the clergy were, in a great meaſure, occaſioned by their exceſſive opulence and their vaſt poſſeſſions, they conceived raſhly the higheſt ideas of the ſalutary effects of indigence, and looked upon voluntary poverty as the moſt eminent and illuſtrious virtue of a

CENT. XI. PART II.

Chriſtian miniſter. They had alſo formed to themſelves a notion, that the primitive church was to be the ſtanding and perpetual model, according to which the rites, government, and worſhip of all Chriſtian churches were to be regulated in all the ages of the world; and that the lives and manners of the holy apoſtles were to be rigorouſly followed, in every reſpect, by all the miniſters of CHRIST. [☞ Theſe notions, which were injudiciouſly taken up, and blindly entertained (without any regard to the difference of times, places, circumſtances, and characters; without conſidering that the provident wiſdom of CHRIST and his apoſtles left many regulations to the prudence and piety of the governors of the church) were productive of many pernicious effects, and threw theſe good reformers, whoſe zeal was not always according to knowledge, from the extreme of ſuperſtition into the extreme of enthuſiaſm.] Many well-meaning perſons, whoſe intentions were highly laudable, fell into great errors in conſequence of theſe ill-grounded notions. Juſtly incenſed at the conduct of the ſuperſtitious multitude, who placed the whole of religion in external ſervices, and hoped to ſecure their ſalvation by the performance of a laborious round of unmeaning rites and ceremonies, they raſhly maintained, that true piety was to be confined entirely to the inward motions and affections of the ſoul, and to the contemplation of ſpiritual and divine things. In conſequence of this ſpecious yet erroneous principle, they treated with the utmoſt contempt all the external parts of religious worſhip, and aimed at nothing leſs than the total ſuppreſſion of ſacraments, churches, religious aſſemblies of every kind, and Chriſtian miniſters of every order.

Commentators and expoſitors.

IV. Several of both the Greek and Latin writers employed their learned and pious labours in the expoſition

expoſition and illuſtration of the holy ſcriptures. Among the Latins, BRUNO wrote a commentary on the *Book of Pſalms*, LANFRANC upon the *Epiſtles of St. Paul*, BERENGER upon the *Revelations of St. John*, GREGORY VII. upon the *Goſpel of St. Matthew*, and others upon other parts of the ſacred writings. But all theſe expoſitors, in compliance with the prevailing cuſtom of the times, either copied the explanations of the ancient commentators, or made ſuch whimſical applications of certain paſſages of ſcripture, both in explaining the doctrines, and in inculcating the duties of religion, that it is often difficult to peruſe them without indignation or diſguſt. The moſt eminent of the Grecian expoſitors was THEOPHYLACT, a native of *Bulgaria*; though he alſo is indebted to the ancients, and, in a particular manner, to St. CHRYSOSTOM, for the greateſt part of his moſt judicious obſervations [z]. Nor muſt we paſs in ſilence the commentary upon the *Book of Pſalms* and the *Song of Solomon*, that was compoſed by the learned MICHAEL PSELLUS; nor the *Chain* of commentaries upon the *Book of Job*, which we owe to the induſtry of NICETAS.

V. All the Latin doctors, if we except a few Hibernian divines, who blended with the beautiful ſimplicity of the goſpel the perplexing ſubtilties of an obſcure philoſophy, had hitherto derived their ſyſtem of religion, and their explications of divine truth, either from the holy ſcriptures alone, or from theſe ſacred oracles explained by the illuſtrations, and compared with the theology, of the ancient doctors. But in this century certain writers, and among others, the famous

Scholaſtic theology.

[z] For an account of THEOPHYLACT, ſee RICH. SIMON. *Hiſt. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* ch. xxviii. p. 390. & *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques, par* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 310. where he alſo ſpeaks largely concerning NICETAS and OECUMENIUS.

BERENGER [*a*], went much farther, and employed the rules of logic and the ſubtilties of metaphyſical diſcuſſions, both in explaining the doctrines of ſcripture, and in proving the truth of their own particular opinions. Hence LANFRANC, the antagoniſt of BERENGER, and afterwards archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, introduced into the field of religious controverſy the ſame philoſophical arms, and ſeemed, in general, deſirous of employing the dictates of reaſon to illuſtrate and confirm the truths of religion. His example, in this reſpect, was followed by ANSELM, his diſciple and ſucceſſor in the ſee of *Canterbury*, a man of a truly metaphyſical genius, and capable of giving the greateſt air of dignity and importance to the *firſt philoſopher*. Such were the beginnings of that philoſophical theology, which grew afterwards, by degrees, into a cloudy and enormous ſyſtem, and from the public ſchools in which it was cultivated, acquired the name of *ſcholaſtic divinity* [*b*]. It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve, that the eminent divines, who firſt ſet on foot this new ſpecies of theology, and thus laudably maintained that moſt noble and natural connexion of FAITH with REASON, and of RELIGION with PHILOSOPHY, were much more prudent and moderate than their followers, in the uſe and application of this conciliatory ſcheme. They kept, for the moſt part, within bounds, and wiſely

☞ [*a*] Otherwiſe called BERENGARIUS, and famous for the noble oppoſition he made to the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which LANFRANC ſo abſurdly pretended to ſupport upon philoſophical principles. The attempt of this latter to introduce the rules of logic into religious controverſy would have been highly laudable, had not he perverted this reſpectable ſcience to the defence of the moſt monſtrous abſurdities.

[*b*] See CHR. AUGUST. HEUMANNI *Præfat. ad Tribbechovii Librum de Doctoribus Scholaſticis*, p. 14.—The ſentiments of the learned, concerning the firſt author or inventor of the ſcholaſtic divinity, are collected by JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, in his *Iſagoge ad Theolog.* tom. i. p. 38.

reflected

reflected upon the limits of reaſon; their language was clear; the queſtions they propoſed were inſtructive and intereſting; they avoided all diſcuſſions that were only proper to ſatisfy a vain and idle curioſity; and, in their diſputes and demonſtrations, they made, generally ſpeaking, a wiſe and ſober uſe of the rules of logic, and of the dictates of philoſophy [c]. [☞ Their fol-

[c] We ſhall here tranſcribe a paſſage from the works of LANFRANC, who is conſidered by many as the father of the ſcholaſtic ſyſtem, that the reader may ſee how far the firſt ſchoolmen ſurpaſſed their diſciples and followers in wiſdom, modeſty, and candour. We take this paſſage from that prelate's book concerning *The body and blood of Chriſt* *, and it is as follows: *Teſtis mihi Deus eſt et conſcientia mea, quia in tractatu divinarum literarum nec proponere nec ad pro. oſitas reſpondere cuperem dialecticas quæſtiones, vel earum ſolutiones. Et ſi quando materia diſputandi talis eſt, ut hujus artis regulis valeat enucleatius explicari, in quantum poſſum, per æquipollentias propoſitionum tego artem, ne videar magis arte, quam veritate, ſanctorumque patrum auctoritate confidere.* LANFRANC here declares in the moſt ſolemn manner, even by an appeal to God and his conſcience, that he was ſo far from having the leaſt inclination to propoſe or to anſwer logical queſtions in the courſe of his theological labours, that, on the contrary, when he was forced to have recourſe to the ſcience of dialectic, in order the better to illuſtrate his ſubject, he concealed the ſuccours he derived from thence with all poſſible care, leſt he ſhould ſeem to place more confidence in the reſources of *art*, than in the ſimplicity of *truth*, and the *authority of the holy fathers*. Theſe laſt words ſhew plainly the *two* ſources from whence the Chriſtian doctors had hitherto derived all their tenets, and the arguments by which they maintained them, *viz.* from the holy ſcriptures, which LANFRANC here calls the *truth*, and from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church. To theſe two ſources of theology and argumentation, a *third* was added in this century, even the ſcience of logic, which, however, was only employed by the managers of controverſy to repulſe their adverſaries, who came armed with ſyllogiſms, or to remove difficulties which were drawn from reaſon and from the nature of things. But, in ſucceeding times, the two former ſources were either entirely neglected or ſparingly employed, and philoſophical demonſtration, or, at leaſt, ſomething that bore that name, was regarded as a ſufficient ſupport to the truths of religion.

* Cap. vii. p. 236. Opp. ed. LUC. DACHERII.

lowers, on the contrary, ran with a metaphyſical frenzy into the greateſt abuſes, and, by the moſt unjuſtifiable perverſion of a wiſe and excellent method of ſearching after, and confirming truth, they baniſhed evidence out of religion, common ſenſe out of philoſophy, and erected a dark and enormous maſs of pretended *ſcience*, in which *words* paſſed for *ideas*, and *ſounds* for *ſenſe*.]

VI. No ſooner was this new method introduced, than the Latin doctors began to reduce all the doctrines of religion into one permanent and connected ſyſtem, and to treat theology as a ſcience; an enterpriſe which had hitherto been attempted by none, but TAIO, of *Saragoſſa*, a writer of the ſeventh century, and the learned DAMASCENAS, who flouriſhed among the Greeks in the following age. The Latin Doctors had hitherto confined their theological labours to certain branches of the Chriſtian religion, which they illuſtrated only on certain occaſions. The firſt production which looked like a general ſyſtem of theology, was that of the celebrated ANSELM; this, however, was ſurpaſſed by the complete and univerſal body of divinity, which was compoſed, towards the concluſion of this century, by HILDEBERT, archbiſhop of *Tours*, who ſeems to have been regarded both as the firſt and the beſt model in this kind of writing, by the innumerable legions of ſyſtem-makers, who aroſe in ſucceeding times [*d*]. This learned prelate demonſtrated firſt the doctrines of his ſyſtem by proofs drawn from the holy ſcriptures, and alſo from the writings of the

[*d*] This body of divinity, which was the firſt complete theological ſyſtem that had been compoſed among the Latins, is inſerted in the *Works* of HILDEBERT, publiſhed by BEAUGENDRE, who ſhews evidently, in his *Preface*, that PETER LOMBARD, PULLUS, and the other writers of theological ſyſtems, did no more than follow ſervilely the traces of HILDEBERT.

ancient

ancient fathers of the church; and in this he followed the cuſtom that had prevailed in the preceding ages; but he went yet farther, and anſwered the objections, which might be brought againſt his doctrine, by arguments drawn from reaſon and philoſophy; this part of his method was entirely new, and peculiar to the age in which he lived [*e*]. CENT. XI. PART II.

VII. The moral writers of this century, who undertook to unfold the obligations of Chriſtians, and to delineate the nature, the extent, and the various branches of true virtue and evangelical obedience, treated this moſt excellent of all ſciences in a manner quite unſuitable to its dignity and importance. We find ſufficient proofs of this in the moral writings of PETER DAMIEN [*f*], and even of the learned HILDEBERT [*g*]. The moraliſts of this age generally confined themſelves to a jejune explication of, what are commonly called, the four cardinal virtues, to which they added the *Ten Commandments*, to complete their ſyſtem. ANSELM, the famous prelate of *Canterbury*, ſurpaſſed, indeed, all the moral writers of his time; the books which he compoſed, with a deſign to promote practical religion, and more eſpecially his *Book of Meditations and Prayers*, contain many excellent things, ſeveral happy thoughts expreſſed with much energy and unc- Moral writers.

[*e*] It may not be improper to place here a paſſage which is taken from a treatiſe of ANSELM's, entitled *Cur Deus homo?* ſince this paſſage was reſpected, by the firſt ſcholaſtic divines, as an immutable law in theology; *Sicut rectus ordo exigit*, ſays the learned prelate, *ut profunda fidei Chriſtianæ credamus, priuſquam ea præſumamus ratione diſcutere: ita negligentia mihi videtur, ſi, poſtquam confirmati ſumus in fide, non ſtudemus quod credimus intelligere:* which amounts to this, *That we muſt firſt believe without examination, but muſt afterwards endeavour to underſtand what we believe.*

[*f*] See PETRUS DAMIANUS, *De Virtutibus.*

[*g*] See HILDEBERTI *Philoſophia Moralis*, et *Libellus de* IV. *Virtutibus honeſtæ vitæ.*

tion. [☞ Nor did the myſtic divines ſatisfy themſelves with piercing, by *extatic thought*, and *feeling*, into the ſublime regions of *beauty* and *love*; they *conceived*, and *brought forth* ſeveral productions that were deſtined to diffuſe the pure delights of *union* and *communion* through enamoured ſouls.] JOHANNES JOHANNELLUS, a Larin myſtic, wrote a treatiſe concerning *Divine Contemplation* [*b*]; and SIMEON, the younger, who was a Grecian ſage of the ſame viſionary claſs, compoſed ſeveral diſcourſes upon ſubjects of a like nature.

The ſtate of controverſial divinity.

VIII. Among the controverſial writers of this century, we ſee the effects of the ſcholaſtic method that BERENGER and LANFRANC had introduced into the ſtudy of theology. We ſee divines entering the liſts armed with ſyllogiſms, which they manage awkwardly, and aiming rather to confound their adverſaries by the ſubtilties of logic, than to convince them by the power of evidence; while thoſe who were unprovided with this philoſophical armour, made a ſtill more wretched and deſpicable figure, fell into the groſſeſt and moſt perverſe blunders, and ſeem to have written without either thinking of their ſubject, or of the manner of treating it with ſucceſs. DAMIANUS, already mentioned, defended the truth of Chriſtianity againſt the Jews; but his ſucceſs was not equal either to the warmth of his zeal, or to the uprightneſs of his intentions. SAMUEL, a convert from *Judaiſm* to Chriſtianity, wrote an elaborate treatiſe againſt thoſe of his nation, which is ſtill extant. But the nobleſt champion that appeared at this period of time in the cauſe of religion, was the famous ANSELM, who attacked the enemies of Chriſtianity, and the audacious contemners of all religion, in an in-

[*b*] See the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 48.

genious

genious work [*i*], which was perhaps, by its depth and acuteneſs, above the comprehenſion of thoſe whom it was deſigned to convince of their errors. [☞ For it happened, no doubt, in theſe earlier times, as it frequently does in our days, that many gave themſelves out for unbelievers, who knew not the firſt principles of reaſoning, and whoſe incredulity was the fruit of ignorance and preſumption, nouriſhed by licentiouſneſs and corruption of heart.]

The controverſy between the Greeks and Latins revived.

IX. The famous conteſt between the Greek and Latin churches, which, though not decided, had, however, been ſuſpended for a conſiderable time, was imprudently revived, in the year 1053, by MICHAEL CERULARIUS, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, a man of a reſtleſs and turbulent ſpirit, who blew the flame of religious diſcord, and widened the fatal breach by new invectives and new accuſations. The pretexts that were employed to juſtify this new rupture, were zeal for the truth, and an anxious concern about the intereſts of religion; but its true cauſes were the arrogance and ambition of the Grecian patriarch and the Roman pontif. The latter was conſtantly forming the moſt artful ſtratagems to reduce the former under his imperious yoke; and, for this purpoſe, he left no means unemployed to gain over to his ſide the biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, by withdrawing them from the juriſdiction of the ſee of *Conſtantinople*. The tumultuous and unhappy ſtate of the Grecian empire was ſingularly favourable to his aſpiring views, as the friendſhip and alliance of the Roman pontif was highly uſeful to the Greeks, in their ſtruggles with the Saracens and the Normans, who were ſettled in *Italy*. On the other hand, the Grecian pontif was not only

[*i*] This work was entitled, *Liber adverſus inſipientem*, i. e. *The fool refuted.*

determined

CENT. XI. PART II.

determined to refuſe obſtinately the leaſt mark of ſubmiſſion to his haughty rival, but was alſo laying ſchemes for extending his dominion, and for reducing all the Oriental patriarchs under his ſupreme juriſdiction. Thus the contending parties were preparing for the field of controverſy, when CERULARIUS began the charge by a warm letter written in his own name, and in the name of LEO, biſhop of *Achrida*, who was his chief counſellor, to JOHN, biſhop of *Trani*, in *Apulia*, in which he publicly accuſed the Latins of various errors [*k*] LEO IX., who was then in the papal chair, anſwered this letter in a moſt imperious manner; and, not ſatisfied with ſhewing his indignation by mere words, aſſembled a council at *Rome*, in which the Greek churches were ſolemnly excommunicated [*l*].

X. CONSTANTINE, ſurnamed *Monomachus*, who was now at the head of the Grecian empire, endeavoured to ſtifle this controverſy in its birth, and, for that purpoſe, deſired the Roman pontif to ſend legates to *Conſtantinople*, to concert meaſures for reſtoring and confirming the tranquillity of the church. Three legates were accordingly ſent from *Rome* to that imperial city, who brought with them letters from LEO IX. not only to the emperor, but alſo to the Grecian pontif. Theſe legates were cardinal HUMBERT, a man of a high and impetuous ſpirit, PETER, archbiſhop of *Amalfi*, and FREDERIC, archdeacon and chancellor of the church of *Rome*. The iſſue of this congreſs was unhappy in the higheſt degree, notwithſtanding the propenſity which the emperor, for political

[*k*] See an account of thoſe errors, § xi.

[*l*] Theſe letters of CERULARIUS and LEO are publiſhed in the *Annals* of BARONIUS, *ad An.* 1053.—The former is alſo inſerted by CANISIUS, in his *Lection. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 281. ed. nov.—LEONIS *Concilia*, &c.

reaſons [*m*], diſcovered to the cauſe of the biſhop of *Rome*. The arrogance of LEO IX., and his inſolent letters, excited the higheſt indignation in the breaſt of CERULARIUS, and produced a perſonal averſion to this audacious pontif, which inflamed, inſtead of healing, the wounds of the church; while, on the other hand, the Roman legates gave many and evident proofs, that the deſign of their embaſſy was not to reſtore peace and concord, but to eſtabliſh among the Greeks the ſupreme authority and the ghoſtly dominion of the Roman pontif. Thus all hopes of a happy concluſion of theſe miſerable diviſions entirely vaniſhed; and the Roman legates finding their efforts ineffectual to overcome the vigorous reſiſtance of CERULARIUS, they, with the higheſt inſolence, as well as imprudence, excommunicated publicly, in the church of *St. Sophia*, A. D. 1054, the Grecian patriarch, with LEO of *Achrida*, and all their adherents; and leaving a written act of their inhuman imprecations and anathemas upon the grand altar of that temple, they *ſhook the duſt off their feet*, and thus departed. This violent ſtep rendered the evil incurable, which it was before not only poſſible, but perhaps eaſy, to remedy. The Grecian patriarch imitated the vehemence of the Roman legates, and did from reſentment what they had perpetrated from a principle of ambition and arrogance. He excommunicated theſe legates with all their adherents and followers in a public council, and procured an order of the emperor for burning the act of excommunication, which they had pronounced againſt the Greeks [*n*]. Theſe

CENT. XI. PART II.

☞ [*m*] He ſtood greatly in need of the aſſiſtance of the Germans and Italians againſt the Normans, and hoped to obtain it by the good offices of the pope, who was in high credit with the emperor HENRY III.

[*n*] Beſides BARONIUS and other writers, whoſe accounts of this period of time are generally known, and not always exact,

CENT. XI. PART II.

These vehement measures were followed on both sides with a multitude of controversial writings, that were filled with the most bitter and irritating invectives, and served no other purpose than to add fuel to the flame.

XI. CERULARIUS added new accusations to the ancient charge, which had been brought by PHOTIUS against the Latin churches, of which the principal was, that they used unleavened bread in the celebration of the Lord's supper. This accusation (such were the times!) was looked upon as a matter of the most serious nature, and of the highest consequence; it was, therefore, debated between the Greeks and Latins with the utmost vehemence, nor did the Grecian and Roman pontifs contend with more fury and bitterness about the extent of their power, and the limits of their jurisdiction, than the Greek and Latin churches disputed about the use of unleavened bread. The other heads of accusation that were brought against the Latins by the Grecian pontif, discovered rather a malignant and contentious spirit, and a profound ignorance of genuine Christianity, than a generous zeal for the cause of truth. He complains, for instance, in the heaviest manner, that the Latins do not abstain from the use of blood, and of things strangled; that their monks eat lard, and permit the use of flesh to such of the brethren as are sick or infirm; that their bishops adorn their fingers with rings, as if they were

exact, see MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. lib. lx. *ad A.* 1053, *et Præf. ad Sæc.* vi. *Actor. SS. Benedicti*, part II. p. 1.—LEO ALLATIUS, *De libris Græcor. Eccleſiaſt. Diſſ.* ii. p. 160. ed. *Fabricii*, et *De perpetua Eccleſ. Orient. et Occident. Conſenſione*, lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 614.—MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriente Chriſtiano*, tom. i. p. 260. *et Diſſ. Damaſcena prima*, § xxxi. p. 16.—HERMANNI *Hiſtoria Concertationum de pane azymo et fermentato*, p. 59. publiſhed at *Leipſic* in the year 1739.—Jo. BAPT. COTELERIUS, *Monum. Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. ii. p. 108.

bride-

bridegrooms; that their prieſts are beardleſs; and that in the rite of baptiſm they confined themſelves to one ſingle immerſion [o]. Such were the miſerable and trifling objects that excited a fatal ſchiſm, and kindled a furious war between the Greeks and Latins, who carried their animoſities to the greateſt lengths, and loaded each other with reciprocal invectives and imprecations. The attentive reader will form from hence a juſt idea of the deplorable ſtate of religion both in the eaſtern and weſtern world at this period, and will ſee, in this dreadful ſchiſm, the true origin of the various ſects that multiplied the different forms of ſuperſtition and error in theſe unhappy times.

A new controverſy concerning the ſanctity of images.

XII. This vehement diſpute, which the Greeks had to carry on againſt the Latin churches, was well nigh followed by a fatal diviſion among themſelves. Amidſt the ſtraits and difficulties to which the empire was now reduced by the expences of war, and the calamities of the times, ALEXIUS not only employed the treaſures of the church, in order to anſwer the exigences of the ſtate, but ordered alſo the plates of ſilver, and the figures of that metal that adorned the portals of the churches, to be taken down and converted into money. This meaſure excited the indignation of LEO, biſhop of *Chalcedon*, a man of auſtere morals, and of an obſtinate ſpirit, who maintained that the emperor, in this ſtep, was guilty of ſacrilege; and, to prove this charge, publiſhed a treatiſe, in which he affirmed, that in the images of JESUS CHRIST, and of the ſaints, there reſided

[o] *See* CERULARII *Epiſtola ad Johannem Tranenſem in Caniſii Lection. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 281. where the reader will alſo find the refutation of this letter by Cardinal HUMBERT.—See likewiſe CERULARII *Epiſtola ad Petrum Antiochenſ.* in COTELERII *Monumentis Eccleſiæ Græc.* tom. ii. p. 138. add to theſe MARTENE, *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 847.

a certain

a certain kind of *inherent ſanctity*, that was a proper object of religious worſhip; and that, therefore, the adoration of Chriſtians ought not to be confined to the perſons repreſented by theſe images, but extended alſo to the images themſelves. This new controverſy excited various tumults and ſeditions among the people, to ſuppreſs which the emperor aſſembled a council at *Conſtantinople*, in which the queſtion was terminated by the following deciſions: "That the images of CHRIST, "and of the *ſaints*, were to be honoured only with "a *relative worſhip* [*p*], which was to be offered, "not to the ſubſtance or matter of which theſe "images were compoſed, but to the *form* and "*features* of which they bore the impreſſion; that "the repreſentations of CHRIST, and of the ſaints, "whether in painting or ſculpture, did in no "ſenſe *partake of the nature* of the divine Saviour, "or of theſe holy men, though they were enriched with a certain communication of divine "grace; and, laſtly, that invocation and worſhip "were to be addreſſed to the ſaints, only as the "ſervants of CHRIST, and on account of their "relation to him, as their maſter." Theſe deciſions, abſurd and ſuperſtitious as they were, were not enough ſo for LEO, the idolatrous biſhop of *Chalcedon*, who maintained his monſtrous ſyſtem with obſtinacy, and was, for that reaſon, ſent into baniſhment [*q*].

Controverſies in the Latin church about the Lord's ſupper.

XIII. The famous diſpute concerning the *preſence* of CHRIST's body and blood in the euchariſt was revived about the middle of this century in the Latin church. Hitherto the diſputants on

[*p*] Σχετικῶς προσκυνεῖσθαι, ὡ λατρευτικῶς τὰς εἰκόνας.

[*q*] An ample account of this whole matter is given by ANNA COMNENA, in her *Alexiad*. lib. v. p. 104. lib. vii. p. 158. edit. *Venet*.—The acts of this council, the very mention of which is omitted by ſeveral hiſtorians of conſiderable note, are publiſhed by MONTFAUCON, in his *Bibliotheca Coiſliniana*, p. 103.

both

both ſides had propoſed their jarring opinions with the utmoſt freedom, unreſtrained by the deſpotic voice of authority, ſince no council had given a definitive ſentence upon this matter, nor preſcribed a rule of faith to terminate all inquiry and debate [*r*]. Hence it was, that, in the beginning of this century, LEUTHERIC, archbiſhop of *Sens*, affirmed, in oppoſition to the general opinion of the times, that none but the ſincere and upright Chriſtian, none but ſaints and real believers, received the body of CHRIST in the holy ſacrament. This opinion, which was broached in the year 1004, was every way proper to excite rumours among the people; but theſe its natural effects were happily prevented by the influence of ROBERT, king of *France*, and the wiſe counſels of ſome prudent friends, who hindered the fanatical prelate from diſſeminating this whimſical invention [*s*]. It was not ſo eaſy to extinguiſh the zeal, or to ſtop the mouth of the famous BERENGER, principal of the public ſchool at *Tours*, and afterwards archbiſhop of *Angers*, a man of a moſt acute and ſubtile genius, and highly renowned both on account of his extenſive learning, and the exemplary ſanctity of his life and manners [*t*]. This eminent eccleſiaſtic maintained publicly, in the year 1045, the doctrine of JOHANNES SCOTUS, oppoſed warmly the mon-

[*r*] The various opinions concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, that were embraced during this century, are collected by MARTENE from an ancient manuſcript, and publiſhed in his *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur*, tom. ii. p. 126.

[*s*] See DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 354.

[*t*] See the *Life* of BERENGER in the *Works* of HILDEBERT, archdeacon of *Mans*, p. 1324.—See alſo *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 197.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom i. p. 304. and the authors mentioned by FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 570. It is probably by a preſs-error, that HILDEBERT is ſtyled *archbiſhop*, inſtead of *archdeacon*, by PARIS *Hiſt.* lib. i. p. 10. edit. *Watts.*

ſtrous

CENT. XI. PART II.

ſtrous opinions of PASCHASIUS RADBERT, which were adapted to captivate a ſuperſtitious multitude by exciting their aſtoniſhment, and perſevered with a noble obſtinacy in teaching, that the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of CHRIST in the euchariſt, but preſerved their natural and eſſential qualities, and were no more than figures and external ſymbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour.—This wiſe and rational doctrine was no ſooner publiſhed, than it was oppoſed by certain doctors in *France* and *Germany*; but the Roman pontif LEO IX. attacked it with peculiar vehemence and fury in the year 1050; and in two councils, the one aſſembled at *Rome*, and the other at *Vercelli*, had the doctrine of BERENGER ſolemnly condemned, and the book of SCOTUS, from which it was drawn, committed to the flames. This example was followed by the council of *Paris*, which was ſummoned the very ſame year by HENRY I., and in which BERENGER, and his numerous adherents, were menaced with all ſorts of evils, both ſpiritual and temporal. Theſe threats were executed, in part, againſt this unhappy prelate, whom HENRY deprived of all his revenues; but neither threatenings, nor fines, nor ſynodical decrees, could ſhake the firmneſs of his mind, or engage him to renounce the doctrine he had embraced.

The pontiffs ſtrive, in vain, to put an end to this debate.

XIV. After theſe proceedings, the controverſy was for ſome years happily ſuſpended, and BERENGER, whoſe patrons were as numerous as his enemies were formidable [*u*], enjoyed, for a while, the ſweets of liberty and peace. His enemies, however, after the death of LEO IX., rekindled the flame of religious diſcord, and perſuaded his ſucceſſor VICTOR II. to examine anew

[*u*] His moſt formidable enemy and rival was LANFRANC, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*.

the doctrine of BERENGER. The pontif complied, and ſent his legates to two different councils that were aſſembled at *Tours*, in the year 1054 [*w*], for that purpoſe. In one of theſe councils the famous HILDEBRAND, who was afterwards pontif under the title of GREGORY VII., appeared in the character of legate, and oppoſed the new doctrine with the utmoſt vehemence. BERENGER was alſo preſent at this aſſembly, and, overpowered with threats, rather than convinced by reaſon and argument, he not only abandoned his opinions, but (if we may believe his adverſaries, to whoſe teſtimony we are confined in this matter) abjured them ſolemnly, and, in conſequence of this humbling ſtep, made his peace with the church.—This abjuration, however, was far from being ſincere, and the docility of BERENGER was no more than an act of diſſimulation; for ſoon after this period, he taught anew, though with more circumſpection and prudence, the opinions he had formerly profeſſed. That his conduct here appears mean and diſhoneſt, is indeed evident; but we are not ſufficiently acquainted with the tranſactions of theſe councils to fix preciſely the degree of his crime.

XV. The account of BERENGER's perfidy being brought to NICOLAS II., the exaſperated pontif ſummoned him to *Rome*, A. D. 1058, and terrified him, in ſuch a manner, in the council held there the following year, that he declared his readineſs to embrace and adhere to the doctrines which that venerable aſſembly ſhould think proper to impoſe upon his faith. HUMBERT was accordingly appointed unanimouſly by NICOLAS and the council to draw up a confeſſion of faith for BERENGER, who ſigned it publicly, and confirmed

☞ [*w*] Other hiſtorians mention but one council, and place it in the year 1055.

his adherence to it by a ſolemn oath. In this confeſſion there was, among other tenets equally abſurd, the following declaration, that *the bread and wine, after conſecration, were not only a* SACRAMENT, *but alſo the* REAL BODY AND BLOOD of JESUS CHRIST; *and that this body and blood* were handled by the prieſts and *conſumed by the faithful, and not in a ſacramental ſenſe, but in reality and truth, as other ſenſible objects are.* This doctrine was ſo monſtrouſly nonſenſical, and was ſuch an impudent inſult upon the very firſt principles of reaſon, that it could have nothing alluring to a man of BERENGER's acute and philoſophical turn, nor could it poſſibly become the object of his ſerious belief, as appeared ſoon after this odious act of diſſimulation; for no ſooner was he returned into *France*, than taking refuge in the countenance and protection of his ancient patrons, he expreſſed the utmoſt deteſtation and abhorrence of the doctrines he had been obliged to profeſs at *Rome*, abjured them ſolemnly both in his diſcourſe and in his writings, and returned zealouſly to the profeſſion and defence of his former, which had always been his real opinion. ALEXANDER II. employed the ſeducing influence of ſoft and friendly expoſtulation to engage BERENGER to diſſemble anew, or, in other words, to return from his pretended apoſtaſy; but his remonſtrances were ineffectual, and that perhaps in a great meaſure, becauſe this rebellious ſon of a ſuperſtitious church was powerfully ſupported in the maintenance of his opinions. Hence the controverſy was prolonged, during many years, by a multitude of writings on both ſides of the queſtion, and the followers of BERENGER increaſed from day to day.

XVI. GREGORY VII., whoſe enterpriſing ſpirit no difficulties nor oppoſitions could diſcourage, was no ſooner raiſed to the pontificate than he undertook

dertook to terminate this important controverſy, and, for that purpoſe, ſent an order to BERENGER, in the year 1078, to repair to *Rome*. Conſidering the natural character of this pontif, his conduct in this affair was highly laudable, and diſcovered a degree of impartiality and candour, which his proceedings upon other occaſions gave little reaſon to expect. He ſeems to have had a high eſteem for BERENGER; and, in the particular points in which he was obliged to oppoſe him, he did it, with all poſſible mildneſs, and with a tenderneſs which ſhewed that he acted rather from a forced compliance with the clamours of his adverſaries, than from inclination or principle. In the council that was held at *Rome* towards the concluſion of the year 1078, he permitted BERENGER to draw up a new confeſſion of his faith, and to renounce that which had been compoſed by HUMBERT, though it had been ſolemnly approved and confirmed by NICOLAS II., and a Roman council. The ſagacious pontif perceived clearly the abſurdity of HUMBERT's confeſſion, and therefore revoked it, though it had been rendered ſacred by papal authority [*x*]. In conſequence of this, the perſecuted prelate made a ſecond declaration, confirmed by an oath, that he would adhere for the future to the following propoſitions: That *the bread laid upon the altar became, after conſecration, the true body of* CHRIST, *which was born of the Virgin, ſuffered on the croſs, and now ſits at the right-hand of the Father:* and that the *wine placed*

[*x*] It is worthy of obſervation, that GREGORY VII, whoſe zeal in extending the juriſdiction, and exalting the authority of the Roman pontifs, ſurpaſſed that of all his predeceſſors, acknowledged, at leaſt tacitly, by this ſtep, that a pope and council might err, and had erred in effect. How otherwiſe could he allow BERENGER to renounce a confeſſion of faith, that had been ſolemnly approved and confirmed by NICOLAS II., in a Roman council?

CENT. XI. PART II.

upon the altar became, after conſecration, the true blood, which flowed from the ſide of CHRIST. The pontif was ſatisfied with this declaration, which was far from producing the ſame effect upon the enemies of BERENGER; they ſhewed that it was ambiguous, and ſo it was in reality; and they inſiſted that BERENGER ſhould be obliged not only to ſign another declaration leſs vague and equivocal, but ſhould alſo be required to prove his ſincerity by the fiery trial. GREGORY refuſed abſolutely this latter demand, and would have equally refuſed the other, had not his favourable intentions towards BERENGER yielded to the importunate clamours of his enemies and perſecutors.

XVII. The pontif, therefore, granted, that part of their demand that related to a new declaration; and, in a council held at *Rome*, A. D. 1079, had a third confeſſion of faith drawn up, which was ſomewhat leſs abſurd than the firſt, though much more harſh than the ſecond, and to which BERENGER, after reading and ſubſcribing it in the midſt of the aſſembly, was obliged to declare his aſſent by a ſolemn oath. By this aſſent, he profeſſed to believe, *That the bread and wine were, by the myſterious influence of the holy prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, ſubſtantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of* JESUS CHRIST: and to remove all grounds of ſuſpicion, to diſpel all doubt about the reality of his attachment to this ridiculous ſyſtem, he added to his ſecond confeſſion [*y*] a ſolemn declaration, that *the bread and wine, after conſecration, were converted into the real body and blood of* CHRIST, *not only in quality of external ſigns and ſacramental repreſentations, but in their eſſential properties, and in ſubſtantial reality.* No ſooner had BERENGER made

[*y*] Mentioned in the preceding ſection.

this

this ſtrange declaration, than the pontif redoubled the marks of eſteem which he had formerly ſhewn him, and ſent him back to his country loaded with the moſt honourable teſtimonies of his liberality and friendſhip. The double-minded doctor did not, however, think himſelf bound by this declaration, ſolemn as it was; and therefore retracted publicly, upon his return to his reſidence, what he had ſubſcribed as his real ſentiments in the council of *Rome*, and went even ſo far as to compoſe an elaborate refutation of the doctrine to which he had been engaged to profeſs his aſſent. This new change excited a warm and vehement controverſy, in which LANFRANC and GUITMUND endeavoured to perplex BERENGER with their ſophiſtry, and to overwhelm him with their invectives. GREGORY VII., to whoſe papal thunder the affronted council looked with impatience, ſeemed neither ſurpriſed nor offended by the inconſtancy of BERENGER, nor did he take any ſtep which could teſtify the ſmalleſt mark of reſentment againſt this pretended apoſtate. From hence it appears more than probable, that the ſecond confeſſion of BERENGER had entirely ſatisfied that pontif; and that the violent impoſition of the third was by no means agreeable to GREGORY, who ſeems to have adopted, in a great meaſure, if not wholly, the ſentiments of BERENGER [z].

XVIII. Amidſt

[z] A remarkable treatiſe of BERENGER's compoſition, which has been publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. iv. p. 99. 109. will contribute to caſt a ſatisfactory light upon this whole affair, and will fully unfold the real ſentiments of GREGORY concerning the euchariſt. For from this piece it is undoubtedly evident; *1ſt*, That BERENGER was eſteemed and favoured, in a ſingular manner by GREGORY VII. *2dly*, That this pontif was of the ſame opinion with BERENGER concerning the euchariſt; it is certain, at leaſt, that he was for adhering to the words of ſcripture in this matter, and was eager in ſuppreſſing all curious reſearches,

XVIII. Amidſt the clamours of his incenſed adverſaries, BERENGER obſerved a profound ſilence,

Berenger's ate, and he progreſs f his doc- rine.

and all poſitive deciſions concerning the manner of CHRIST's preſence in the holy ſacrament. This appears evidently from the following words, which he addreſſed to BERENGER before the meeting of the laſt council of *Rome*, and in which he ſpeaks of his deſign to conſult the Virgin MARY concerning the conduct which it was proper for him to obſerve in the courſe of this controverſy: *Ego plane te* (ſays the pontif in the 108th page of the work, cited in the beginning of this note) *de Chriſti ſacrificio ſecundum ſcripturas bene ſentire non dubito: tamen quia conſuetudinis mihi eſt, ad B. Mariam de his quæ movent recurrere—impoſui religioſo cuidam amico—a B. Maria obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret, ſed verbis commendaret, quorſum me de negotio quod in manibus habebam de Chriſti ſacrificio reciperem, in quo immotus perſiſterem.* We ſee here plainly, that GREGORY expreſſes the ſtrongeſt propenſity to the ſentiments of BERENGER, not, however, without ſome heſitation concerning the manner in which he was to conduct himſelf, and alſo concerning the preciſe doctrine, which it was neceſſary to embrace in relation to the preſence of CHRIST in the euchariſt. It was this heſitation which led him to conſult the Virgin MARY, whoſe anſwer the pontif gives in the following words: *A. B. Maria audivit et ad me retulit, nihil de ſacrificio Chriſti cogitandum, nihil eſſe tenendum, niſi quod tenerent authenticæ ſcripturæ, contra quas* BERENGARIUS *nihil habebat. Hoc tibi manifeſtare volui, ut ſecuriorem ad nos fiduciam & alacriorem ſtem habeas.* Here we ſee an anſwer of the Virgin pronouncing, that it was neceſſary to adhere to the expreſs declarations of ſcripture concerning the preſence of CHRIST in the ſacrament; and whether GREGORY was fanatical enough to confide in this anſwer as real, or rogue enough to forge it, it is ſtill certain, that he confined his belief concerning the point in debate to the language of ſcripture, and held that the true body and blood of CHRIST were exhibited in the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, though it was neither neceſſary nor expedient to enquire into the nature or manner of this myſterious preſence. 3dly, It appears manifeſt from the treatiſe already mentioned, that the aſſembling of the ſecond council, and the impoſition of another confeſſion of faith upon the conſcience of BERENGER, were meaſures into which GREGORY was forced by the enemies of that eccleſiaſtic. *Dejectus eſt*, ſays BERENGER, ſpeaking of that pontif, *importunitate Paduani ſcurræ, non epiſcopi, et Piſani non epiſcopi, ſed antichriſti . . . ut permitteret calumniatoribus veritatis in poſteriori quadrageſimali concilio ſcriptum a ſe firmatum in priori mutari.* 4thly, We ſee here

the

ſilence, and was prudent enough to return no answer to their bitter and repeated invectives. Fatigued with a controverſy, in which the firſt principles of reaſon were ſo impudently inſulted, and exhauſted by an oppoſition which he was unable to overcome, he abandoned all his worldly concerns, and retired to the iſle of *St. Coſme*, in the neighbourhood of *Tours*, where he ſpent the remainder of his days in faſting, prayer, and pious exerciſes. In the year 1088, death put an end to the affliction he ſuffered in his retirement, from a bitter reflection upon the diſſimulation he had been guilty of at *Rome*, and to the penitential acts of mortification and auſterity, to which he ſeems to have ſubmitted with a deſign to expiate the enormity of his criminal compliance, and the guilt of his perjury [*a*]. He left behind him in

the true reaſon why GREGORY ſhewed not the ſmalleſt mark of reſentment againſt BERENGER, when, upon his return to his own country, he violated the promiſe by which he had ſo ſolemnly bound himſelf in the laſt council, and refuted the confeſſion to which he had ſworn his aſſent. For the pontif was very far from adopting the ſentiments of thoſe who had drawn up or ſuggeſted that monſtrous confeſſion, and eſteemed it ſufficient to believe with BERENGER, that the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST were exhibited to Chriſtians in the euchariſt. Hence he left the violent adverſaries of his perſecuted friend murmur, ſcribble, bawl, and refute, while he himſelf obſerved a profound ſilence, and perſiſted in his reſolution to put that unhappy man to no farther trouble. It is, however, proper to obſerve, that in the ſame book from whence theſe particulars are taken, we find BERENGER addreſſing himſelf, with the utmoſt humility, to the divine mercy, for the pardon of the crime of diſſimulation and perjury he had committed at *Rome*; and confeſſing that the fear of death had extorted from him oaths and declarations diametrically oppoſite to his real ſentiments, and engaged him to ſubſcribe to a ſet of tenets which he abhorred. *Deus omnipotens*, ſays he, *miſerere, fons miſericordiarum, tantum ſacrilegium agnoſcenti.*

[*a*] This will appear evident to ſuch as peruſe the treatiſe of his compoſition, which we have mentioned in the preceding note, as publiſhed in MARTENE'S *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. iv. p. 109.

the minds of the people a deep impreſſion of his extraordinary ſanctity; and his followers were as numerous as his fame was illuſtrious [b]. There have been diſputes among the learned about the real ſentiments of this eminent man: yet, notwithſtanding the art which he ſometimes uſed to conceal his opinions, and the ambiguity that is often remarkable in his expreſſions, whoever examines with impartiality and attention ſuch of his writings as are yet extant, will immediately perceive, that he looked upon the bread and wine in the ſacrament as no more than the ſigns or ſymbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour [c]. In this opinion BERENGER perſevered to the laſt; nor have we any authentic proof of

[b] The canons of the cathedral of *Tours* continue to honour the memory of BERENGER by an annual proceſſion, in which they perform a ſolemn ſervice at his tomb in the iſle of *St. Coſme*. See MOLEON, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 130.

[c] MABILLON, and other Roman catholic writers, as alſo a few Lutheran divines, are of opinion, that BERENGER denied only the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, while he maintained, at the ſame time, the real preſence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the euchariſt. And this opinion will, indeed, appear plauſible to ſuch as conſider only the declaration he ſigned in the firſt council at *Rome*, to which he was ſummoned by GREGORY VII., and which he never retracted, without comparing this declaration with the reſt of his writings. On the other hand, USHER, BASNAGE, and almoſt all the writers of the reformed church maintain, that the doctrine of BERENGER was exactly the ſame with that which CALVIN afterwards adopted; and I cannot help joining with them in this opinion, when I peruſe attentively the following words of his *Letter* to ALMANNUS, publiſhed in MARTENE'S *Theſaur.* tom. iv. p. 109. *Conſtat*, ſays BERENGER in expreſs terms, *verum Chriſti corpus in ipſa menſa proponi*, SED SPIRITUALITER INTERIORI HOMINI VERUM *in ea Chriſti corpus ab his duntaxat, qui Chriſti membra ſunt, incorruptum, intaminatum, inattritumque* SPIRITUALITER MANDUCARI. Theſe words demonſtrate ſo clearly, that, by the *preſence of* CHRIST'S body in the euchariſt, BERENGER meant no more than a *ſpiritual preſence*, that they diſpel all doubt about his real ſentiments, though, upon other occaſions, he concealed theſe ſentiments under dubious expreſſions, to deceive his adverſaries.

his

his having departed from it before his death, as some of the Roman catholic writers vainly pretend [*d*]. CENT. XI. PART II.

XIX. It

[*d*] It is well known what laborious efforts the Roman catholic writers have employed to perſuade us, that BERENGER, before his death, abandoned the opinion he had ſo long and ſo warmly defended, and returned to the doctrine of the church of *Rome* concerning the corporal preſence of CHRIST in the euchariſt. But when we enquire into the reaſons on which this aſſertion is founded, we ſhall immediately perceive their weakneſs and inſufficiency. They allege, in the firſt place, that BERENGER *gave an account of his doctrine and belief* in the council of *Bourdeaux*, A. D. 1087; and add to this, that the ancient writers applaud his penitential ſentiments, and affirm that he died in the catholic faith. In all this, however, we ſee no proof of BERENGER's retractation. He adhered, indeed, to the confeſſion of faith, which he had ſubſcribed and adopted in the firſt of the two Roman councils, to which he had been ſummoned by GREGORY VII., and which that pontif judged ſufficient to clear him from the imputation of hereſy; and they who confined their attention to the *literal ſenſe* of the words of that confeſſion, without conſidering their *ſpirit*, and the different meanings of which they were ſuſceptible, might eaſily imagine that BERENGER's confeſſion was agreeable to the doctrine of the church. GREGORY, in order to pacify matters, confirmed them in this notion; and though he was well informed of BERENGER's having retracted the confeſſion which he had ſigned in the laſt Roman council before which he appeared, and of his oppoſing, with the utmoſt warmth, the opinion he had there ſo ſolemnly profeſſed, yet he let the inconſtant doctor remain unmoleſted, and thereby tacitly acquitted him of the crime and the error that were laid to his charge.

It is of the utmoſt importance to obſerve here, that the Roman church was not come, in this century, to a fixed determination concerning the *nature* and *manner* of CHRIST's preſence in the euchariſt. This appears moſt evidently from the three confeſſions which BERENGER ſigned by the order of three councils, which confeſſions differed from each other, not only in the terms and the turn of expreſſion, but alſo in the opinions and doctrines they contained. Pope NICOLAS II., and the council he aſſembled at *Rome*, A. D. 1059, obliged him to ſubſcribe, as the true and orthodox doctrine of the church, the firſt of theſe confeſſions, which was compoſed by Cardinal HUMBERT. This confeſſion was however rejected, not only as harſh in point of expreſſion, but alſo as erroneous and

XIX. It is not rare to find in the hiſtory of the church, the moſt trifling objects exciting the warmeſt

A controverſy concerning Martial.

and unſound, by GREGORY and the two Roman councils, which he had expreſsly ſummoned to enquire into that matter; for had HUMBERT's declaration appeared to the pontif to be a juſt expreſſion of the doctrine and ſenſe of the church concerning the euchariſt, neither he nor the ſucceeding councils would have permitted other forms of doctrine to be ſubſtituted in its place. GREGORY, as we have already ſeen, was of opinion, that it was highly improper to pry with too much curioſity into the myſteries of the euchariſt, and that, laying aſide all diſputes concerning the *manner* of CHRIST's preſence in that holy inſtitution, it was ſafeſt to adhere to the plain words of ſcripture; and as this was alſo the opinion of BERENGER, and was plainly expreſſed in his confeſſion of faith, the judicious pontif pronounced him innocent. But a following council departed from this equitable ſentence of GREGORY, who, tho' with much reluctance, was induced to confirm their rigorous deciſions; and hence aroſe a third confeſſion, which was extremely different from the two preceding ones. We may remark by the by, that in this controverſy the councils ſeem plainly to have ſwayed the pontifs, ſince we ſee the obſtinate, the invincible GREGORY yielding, againſt his will, to one of theſe clamorous aſſemblies. BERENGER had no ſooner got out of the hands of his enemies, than he returned to the ſecond confeſſion, which the pontif had approved, and publicly declaimed againſt that which had been impoſed upon him in the laſt Roman council before which he had appeared, without receiving the leaſt mark of diſapprobation from GREGORY.—From this it was natural to conclude, that, although he oppoſed the decree of that council, he adopted nevertheleſs the opinion of the pope and of the church.

In the account which I have here given of this memorable controverſy, I have not only conſulted the ancient records relating to that matter, which have been made public (for ſeveral of them lie as yet in MSS. in the cabinets of the curious) but have alſo been aſſiſted by the labours of thoſe among the learned, who have treated that important branch of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory in the moſt ample and accurate manner: ſuch as firſt, FRANC. DE ROYE's book, publiſhed at *Angers* in the year 1656; *Ad Can. Ego Berengarius* 41. *de conſecrat. diſtinct.* 2. *Ubi vita, hæreſis, et pœnitentia Berengarii Andegavenſis Archidiaconi, et ad Joſephi locum de Chriſto* (a book which is extremely curious, and very little known). MABILLON's *Præfat. ad* tom. ix. *Act. SS. Ord. Bened. ſeu Sæc.* vi. part II. p. 4. *et Diſſert. de multiplici damnatione, fidei profeſſione et lapſo*, which is

publiſhed

warmeſt and moſt vehement controverſies. Such was the diſpute that aroſe in *France*, in the year 1023, between the prieſts and monks of *Limoges*, concerning the place that was to be aſſigned in the public liturgy to MARTIAL, the firſt biſhop of that dioceſe. One party headed by JORDAN, biſhop of *Limoges*, were for placing him among the *confeſſors*; while HUGO, abbot of the monaſtery of *St. Martial*, maintained, that the prelate in queſtion was to be ranked among the *apoſtles*, and branded, with the opprobrious and heretical title of *Ebionites*, all ſuch as adhered to the propoſal of JORDAN. This *momentous* affair was debated firſt, in a council held at *Poitiers* in the year 1023, and in another aſſembled at *Paris* the year following, in which latter it was determined, that MARTIAL was to be honoured with the title of an *apoſtle*, and that all who refuſed him this eminent rank were to be conſidered as Ebionites, who, as is well known, confined the number of the apoſtles to twelve, that they might exclude St. PAUL from that ſacred order. The decree, however, of this council did not produce the effects that were expected from it; for it exaſperated, inſtead of calming, the zeal and animoſity of the contending parties, ſo that this miſerable diſpute became daily more univerſal, and ſpread like a contagion through all the provinces of *France*. The matter was, at length, brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontif, JOHN XIX., who decided it

publiſhed in his *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 456. DE BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 404. tom. ii. p. 452. The authors of the reformed church, which I have followed in this controverſy, are, USSERIUS, *De ſucceſſione Eccleſiar. Chriſtianar. in occidente*, cap. vii. § 24. p. 195.—BASNAGE, *Hiſt. des Egliſes Reformées*, tom. i. p. 105. *et Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. ii. p. 1391.—CAS. OUDIN, *Diſſert. de Doctrina et Scriptis Berengarii in Comment. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ii. p. 624. There appears more or leſs a certain ſpirit of partiality in all theſe writers; but this ſpirit is particularly notorious among thoſe of the church of *Rome*.

in favour of the monks; and, in a letter addreſſed to JORDAN and the other biſhops of the nation, pronounced MARTIAL worthy of the title and honours of an apoſtle. This deciſion produced the moſt ſubſtantial and permanent effects: for in a council aſſembled at *Limoges*, A. D. 1029, JORDAN declared his acquieſcence in the papal ſentence; in a provincial council at *Bourges*, two years after, MARTIAL was aſſociated to the company of the apoſtles with great ſolemnity, in conſequence of the deciſion of the Roman ſee, and about the ſame time this controverſy was completely and finally terminated in a numerous council aſſembled at *Limoges*, in which the prayers that had been conſecrated to the memory of the apoſtle MARTIAL by the zealous pontif were publicly recited [*e*]. The warm contenders for the apoſtleſhip of MARTIAL aſſerted, that he was one of the ſeventy diſciples of CHRIST; from whence they concluded that he had an equal title with PAUL and BARNABAS to the honour of an apoſtle.

[*e*] See BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 372. 101.—J. LONGEVAL, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. vii. p. 188, 189, 231.—The Benedictine monks, in their *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. *Append. Documentor.* p. 162, have publiſhed the *Letter of* JORDAN *to Pope* BENEDICT VIII., *againſt the Apoſtleſhip of* MARTIAL. The decrees of the councils of *Bourges* and *Limoges* concerning this matter are publiſhed by LABBE, in his *Biblioth. Nova Manuſcriptor.* tom. ii. p. 766. MABILLON has given an ample account of ADEMAR, a monk of *St. Cybar*, the firſt promoter of this ridiculous controverſy, in his *Annal. Ord. S. Benedict.* tom. iv. p. 318. and among the original papers ſubjoined to that volume, has publiſhed a letter wrote by that monk in favour of the apoſtleſhip of MARTIAL. See alſo the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 301.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

I. THE form of public worſhip, which was eſtabliſhed at *Rome*, had not, as yet, been univerſally received in the weſtern provinces. This was looked upon by the imperious pontifs as an inſult upon their authority, and therefore they uſed their utmoſt efforts to introduce the Roman ceremonies every where, and to promote a perfect uniformity of worſhip in every part of the Latin world. GREGORY VII. employed all his diligence, activity, and zeal in this enterpriſe, as appears from ſeveral paſſages in his letters, and he perhaps alone was equal to the execution of ſuch an arduous attempt. The Spaniards had long diſtinguiſhed themſelves above all other nations by the noble and reſolute reſiſtance they made to the deſpotic attempts of the popes upon this occaſion; for they adhered to their ancient *Gothic* liturgy [*f*] with the utmoſt obſtinacy, and could not be brought to change it for the method of worſhip eſtabliſhed at *Rome*. ALEXANDER II. had indeed proceeded ſo far, in the year 1068, as to perſuade the inhabitants of *Arragon* into his meaſures [*g*], and to conquer the averſion which the Catalonians had diſcovered for the Roman worſhip. But the honour of finiſhing this difficult work, and bringing it to perfection, was reſerved for GREGORY VII., who, without interruption, exhorted, threatened, admoniſhed, and intreated

[*f*] See MABILLON, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 10.—Jo. BONA, *Rerum Liturgicarum*, lib. i. cap. xi. p. 220. opp.—PETR. LE BRUN, *Explication des Ceremonies de la Maſſe*, tom. ii. *Diſſ.* v. p. 272.

[*g*] PETR. DE MARCA, *Hiſtoire de Bearn*, liv. ii. cap. ix.

CENT. XI. PART II.

SANCIUS and ALPHONSO, the kings of *Arragon* and *Caſtile*, until, fatigued with the importunity of this reſtleſs pontif, they conſented to aboliſh the Gothic ſervice in their churches, and to introduce the Roman in its place. SANCIUS was the firſt who complied with the requeſt of the pontif, and, in the year 1080, his example was followed by ALPHONSO. The methods which the nobles of *Caſtile* employed to decide the matter were very extraordinary. Firſt, they choſe two champions, who were to determine the controverſy by ſingle combat, the one fighting for the Roman liturgy, the other for the Gothic. This firſt trial ended in favour of the latter; for the Gothic hero proved victorious. The fiery trial was next made uſe of to terminate the diſpute; the Roman and Gothic liturgies were committed to the flames, which, as the ſtory goes, conſumed the former, while the latter remained unblemiſhed and entire. Thus were the Gothic rites crowned with a double victory, which, however, was not ſufficient to maintain them againſt the authority of the pope, and the influence of the queen CONSTANTIA, who determined ALPHONSO in favour of the Roman ſervice [*h*].

Divine worſhip performed in an unknown and foreign tongue.

II. The zeal of the Roman pontifs for introducing an uniformity of worſhip into the weſtern churches may be, in ſome meaſure, juſtified; but their not permitting every nation to celebrate divine worſhip in their mother tongue was abſolutely inexcuſable. While, indeed, the Latin language was in general uſe among the weſtern nations, or, at leaſt, was unknown to but a very ſmall number, there was no reaſon why it ſhould not be employed in the public ſervice of the church. But when the decline of the Roman em-

[*h*] BONA, *Rerum Liturgicar.* lib. i. cap. xi. p. 216.—LE BRUN, *loc. citat.* p. 292.—JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hiſt. de l'Eſpagne*, tom. iii. p. 237, 241, 246.

pire

pire drew on by degrees the extinction of its language in ſeveral places, and its decay in all the weſtern provinces, it became juſt and reaſonable that each people ſhould ſerve the Deity in the language they underſtood, and which was peculiar to them. This reaſoning, however evident and ſtriking, had no ſort of influence upon the Roman pontifs, who, neither in this nor in the following centuries, could be perſuaded to change the eſtabliſhed cuſtom, but perſiſted, on the contrary, with the moſt ſenſeleſs obſtinacy, in retaining the uſe of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worſhip, even when it was no longer underſtood by the people [*i*]. This ſtrange conduct has been variouſly accounted for by different writers, who have tortured their inventions to find out its ſecret reaſons, and have imagined many that ſeem extremely improbable and far-fetched. A ſuperſtitious and extravagant veneration for whatever carried the hoary aſpect of a remote antiquity, was undoubtedly the principal reaſon that rendered the pontifs unwilling to aboliſh the uſe of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worſhip. The ſame abſurd principle produced a ſimilar effect in the eaſtern churches; thus the Egyptian Chriſtians perform their religious ſervice in the language of the ancient Copts, the Jacobites and the Neſtorians in the Syriac, and the Abyſſinians in the old Æthiopic, though all theſe languages have been long ſince obſolete, and are thereby become abſolutely unintelligible to the multitude [*k*].

Ceremonies multiplied.

III. It would be tedious to enumerate, in a circumſtantial manner, the new inventions that

[*i*] USSERIUS, *Hiſtoria Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis ab* HEN. WHARTONO *edita et aucta, Londini* 1690, in 4to.

[*k*] See EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Diſſertat. de Liturgiarum Oriental. origine et antiquitate*, cap. vi. p. 49.

were

CENT. XI. PART II.

were impoſed upon Chriſtians, in this century, under the ſpecious titles of piety and zeal, by the ſuperſtitious deſpotiſm of an imperious clergy. It would be alſo endleſs to mention the additions that were made to former inventions, the multiplication, for example, of the rites and ceremonies that were uſed in the worſhip of ſaints, relics, and images, and the new directions that were adminiſtered to ſuch as undertook pilgrimages, or other ſuperſtitious ſervices of that nature. We ſhall only obſerve, that, during the whole of this century, all the European nations were moſt diligently employed in rebuilding, repairing, and adorning their churches [*l*]. Nor will this appear ſurpriſing, when we conſider, that, in the preceding century, all *Europe* was alarmed with a diſmal apprehenſion that the *day of judgment* was at hand, and that the world was approaching to its final diſſolution; for, among the other effects of this panic terror, the churches and monaſteries were ſuffered to fall into ruin, or at leaſt to remain without repair, from a notion that they would ſoon be involved in the general fate of all ſublunary things. But when theſe apprehenſions were removed, things immediately put on a new face; the tottering temples were rebuilt, and the greateſt zeal, attended with the richeſt and moſt liberal donations, was employed in reſtoring the ſacred edifices to their former luſtre, or rather in giving them new degrees of magnificence and beauty.

[*l*] GLABER. RODOLPHUS, *Hiſt.* lib. iii. cap. iv. in DUCHESNE's *Scriptor. Franc.* tom. iv. p. 217. *Infra milleſimum tertio jam fere imminente anno contigit in univerſo pene terrarum orbe, præcipue tamen in Italia et in Galliis, innovari Eccleſiarum baſilicas.*

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

CENT. XI. PART II.

Ancient ſects.

I. THE ſtate of the ancient ſects, and particularly of the Neſtorians and Monophyſites, who reſided in *Aſia* and *Egypt* under the Mahometan government, was now much the ſame that it had been in the preceding century, neither extremely proſperous, nor abſolutely miſerable. The caſe of the Manichæans, or Paulicians, whom the Grecian emperors had baniſhed from the eaſtern provinces into *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, was much more unhappy, on account of the perpetual conflicts they had to ſuſtain with the Greeks, who perſecuted and oppreſſed them with much keenneſs and animoſity. The Greeks, as uſually happens upon like occaſions, laid the blame of their violent meaſures upon the Manichæans, whom they repreſented as a turbulent, perfidious, and ſanguinary faction, and as the declared and inveterate enemies of the Grecian empire [*m*]. This, however, is by no means to be received as an impartial ſtate of the caſe; at leaſt, it appears from many circumſtances, that if the Manichæans were exaſperated againſt the Greeks, their reſentment was owing to the violent and injurious treatment they had received from them. The Grecian pontifs and clergy were far from being deſtitute of the odious ſpirit of perſecution; and it is certain that the emperors, inſtigated and ſet on by them, had exhauſted the patience of the Paulicians by repeated cruelties and vexations, and alienated their affections by inflicting upon

Manichæans.

[*m*] ANNA COMNENA *Alexiados*, lib. v. p. 105. lib. vi. p. 124. 126. 145.

CENT. XI. PART II.

them, without interruption, a variety of puniſhments, ſuch as baniſhment, confiſcation of goods, and other ſuch marks of ſeverity and violence.

ALEXIUS COMNENUS, who, by his learning, was an ornament to the imperial ſceptre, perceiving that the Manichæans were not to be vanquiſhed, without the greateſt difficulty, by the force of arms, and obſerving alſo that their numbers increaſed from day to day both in *Thrace* and in the adjacent provinces, had recourſe to the power of reaſon and argument to conquer their obſtinacy, and ſpent whole days at *Philippopolis*, in diſputing with the principal doctors of that pernicious ſect. Many of them yielded to the victorious arguments of this royal diſputant, and his learned aſſociates; nor is this to be ſo much wondered at, ſince their demonſtrations were accompanied and inforced by rewards and puniſhments. Such of the Manichæans as retracted their errors, and returned to the boſom of the Greek church, were loaded with gifts, honours, and privileges, according to their reſpective ſtations; while ſuch as ſtood firm againſt the reaſoning of the emperor, were inhumanly condemned to perpetual impriſonment [*n*].

An account of the Paulicians in *Europe*.

II. Many of the Paulicians, either from a principle of zeal for the propagation of their opinions, or from a deſire of getting rid of the perſecution and oppreſſion they ſuffered under the Grecian yoke, retired from *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, and formed ſettlements in other countries. Their firſt migration was into *Italy*; from whence, in proceſs of time, they ſent colonies into almoſt all the other provinces of *Europe*, and formed gradually a conſiderable number of religious aſſem-

[*n*] There is an ample and circumſtantial account of this controverſy between the emperor and the Manichæans in the work mentioned in the preceding note, *lib.* xiv. *p.* 337.

blies,

blies, who had adhered to their doctrine, and who were afterwards persecuted with the utmost vehemence by the Roman pontifs [o]. It is difficult to fix the precise period of time when the Paulicians began to take refuge in *Europe*; it is, however, undoubtedly certain from the most authentic testimonies, that a considerable number of that sect were, about the middle of this century, settled in *Lombardy*, *Insubria*, and principally at *Milan*; and that many of them led a wandering life in *France*, *Germany*, and other countries, where they captivated the esteem and admiration of the

[o] See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiquitat. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 83.—LIMBORCH. *Historia Inquisitionis*, p. 31.—THOM. AUG. RICHINII *Dissertatio de Catharis*, which is prefixed to the *Summa* B. MONETÆ *contra Catharos*, p. 17, 18. We might also refer, upon this occasion, to GLAB. RODULPH. *Histor.* lib. iii. cap. viii. to MATTH. PARIS, and other ancient writers. Certain Italian authors, and among others RICHINI, seem unwilling to acknowledge, that the Paulicians arrived first in *Italy*, and proceeded from thence into the other provinces of *Europe*; and maintain, on the contrary, that their first settlement was in *France*, and that from thence they came into *Italy*. These writers look upon it as ignominious to their country, to be considered as the first European nation which fostered such a pernicious and impious sect in its bosom. Be that as it may, their hypothesis is favoured by PETR. DE MARCA himself, a Frenchman, who, in his *Histoire de Bearn*, livr. viii. cap. xiv. p. 728. declares it as his opinion, that the Paulicians joined themselves to the Gallic armies that returned from the *holy war in Palestine*, by the province of *Bulgaria*, and were thus conducted into *France*. But that learned author alleges no proof to support this opinion: it appears, on the contrary, from the records of the *Inquisition of Thoulouse*, published by LIMBORCH, and from other authentic pieces, that the Paulicians settled first in *Sicily*, *Lombardy*, *Liguria*, and the *Milanese*, and sent from thence their doctors and missionaries into *France*. See the *Codex Tolosanus*, p. 13, 14, 32. 68, 69, & *passim*. We learn also from the *Code of Thoulouse*, that the French Paulicians, who were called *Albigenses*, had no bishop to consecrate their *Anciani* (such was the title they gave to their presbyters); so that such of them as were desirous of being placed in the order of presbyters, were obliged to repair to *Italy*, in order to their being regularly installed.

multitude, by their ſanctimonious looks, and the uncommon air of piety, which they put on with much affectation. In *Italy* they were called *Paterini* and *Cathari*, or rather *Gazari*, which latter appellation the Germans have preſerved, with a ſmall alteration only, which was proper to adapt it to the genius of their language [*p*]. In *France* they were called *Albigenſes*, from the town of *Alby*, in the Upper *Languedoc*, in Latin *Albigia* [*q*]. They were likewiſe called *Bulgarians*, in *France*, becauſe they came from *Bulgaria*, and becauſe the head of their ſect reſided in that country; as alſo *Publicans*, which was probably a corrupt pronunciation of *Paulicians*, and *boni homines* or *good men*, with ſeveral other titles and epithets [*r*].

III. The

[*p*] The title of *Paterini*, which was given to this ſect in *Italy*, has been already explained in the ſecond Chapter of the ſecond Part of this Century, Sect. 13, Note [*r*]. As to the term *Catharus*, it was, undoubtedly, when applied to the Paulicians, the ſame with *Gazarus*, as I have elſewhere demonſtrated. See *Hiſtor. Ord. Apoſtol.* p. 367. The country which bore, in this century, the name of *Gazaria*, was what we now call the *Leſſer Tartary*.

[*q*] That the Paulicians were called *Albigenſes* in *France*, and were a ſect entirely diſtinct from the *Waldenſes* and other heretics, appears evidently from the *Codex Inquiſitionis Toloſanæ*, already mentioned. They received this name from a town in *Aquitain*, called *Albigia*, or *Alby*, where their errors were condemned in a council held in the year 1176. See CHATEL, *Memoires de l'Hiſtoire de Languedoc*, p. 305. It is, therefore, a miſtake to conſider the *Albigenſes*, as a ſect ſo called from *Alby*'s being the place of their birth, their reſidence, or the ſeat of their principal aſſembly; ſince that name was given them for no other reaſon than their having been condemned in a council held in that town. There were, indeed, ſeveral Paulicians among the various ſects of diſſenters from the church of *Rome*, that inhabited the country about *Alby*; and it is alſo true, that the title of *Albigenſes* is uſually extended to all the heretics, of whatever ſect or denomination they were, who dwelt in theſe parts.

[*r*] The learned DU FRESNE, in his *Gloſſarium Latin. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1338, has proved, in an ample manner, that the Paulicians were called in *France Bulgares*, and, by a corrupt

III. The firſt religious aſſembly which the Paulicians had formed in *Europe*, is ſaid to have been diſcovered at *Orleans*, in the year 1017, under the reign of ROBERT. A certain Italian lady is ſaid to have been at the head of this ſect; its principal members were twelve canons of the cathedral of *Orleans*, men eminently diſtinguiſhed by their piety and learning, among whom LISOSIUS and STEPHEN held the firſt rank; and it was compoſed, in general, of a conſiderable number of citizens, who were far from being of the meaneſt condition. The impious doctrines, profeſſed by theſe canons, were diſcovered by a certain prieſt named HERIBERT, and by ARIFASTUS, a Norman nobleman, upon which ROBERT aſſembled a council at *Orleans*, and employed the moſt effectual methods that could be thought of to bring theſe heretics to a better mind. But all his endeavours were to no purpoſe; this pernicious ſect adhered obſtinately to their principles, and hence they were at length condemned to be burnt alive [*s*].

The Manichæans of *Orleans* ſeem to have been Myſtics.

It is difficult to come to a fixed determination with reſpect to the character and doctrine of theſe people; for when we examine matters attentively,

rupt pronunciation of that word, *Bougres*. The ſame author, in his *Obſervationes ad Villeharduini Hiſtoriam Conſtantinopoli.* p. 169. has fully demonſtrated, that the names *Popolicani* and *Publicani*, that were impoſed upon theſe Manichæans, were no more than a corruption of the term *Pauliciani* ill pronounced. The appellation of *Boni Homines*, or *Los bos Homes*, as the ſouthern French ſpoke at that time, was a title which the Paulicians attributed to themſelves. See the *Codex Inquiſit. Toloſanæ*, p. 22. 84. 95, &c. and more eſpecially p. 131.

[*s*] The accounts that the ancient writers have given of theſe heretics are collected by BOULAY, in his *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 364.—CHARL. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collection. judicior. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 5.—JO. LAUNOY, *De Scholis celebrioribus Caroli Magni*, cap. xxiv. p. 90.—The hiſtory of the ſynod of *Orleans*, in which this ſect was condemned, is given by LUC. DACHERIUS, in his *Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 604.

CENT. XI. PART II.

we find that even their enemies acknowledged the ſincerity of their piety; that they were blackened by accuſations which were evidently falſe; and that the opinions for which they were puniſhed, differ widely from the Manichæan ſyſtem [*t*]. As far as we can ſee into the caſe, it appears to us, that theſe pretended Manichæans of *Orleans* were a ſet of *Myſtics*, who looked with contempt upon all external worſhip, rejected all rites and ceremonies, and even the Chriſtian ſacraments, as deſtitute of any, even the leaſt ſpiritual efficacy or virtue, placed the whole of religion in the internal contemplation of God, and the elevation of the ſoul to divine and celeſtial things; and in their philoſophical ſpeculations concerning God, the Trinity, and the human ſoul, ſoared above the comprehenſion of the age in which they lived. A like ſet of men proceeded in vaſt numbers out of *Italy* in the following ages, ſpread like an inundation through all the European provinces, and were known in *Germany* under the name of the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, while they were diſtinguiſhed in other countries by the appellation of *Beghards* [*u*].

[*t*] BASNAGE, in his *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformées*, tom. i. period iv. p. 97. and in his *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. ii. p. 1388. pleads the cauſe of the canons of *Orleans*; but this learned and worthy man ſeems to have been carried too far by his zeal for augmenting the number of thoſe who have been martyrs to the truth.

[*u*] We ſhall have occaſion to give a fuller account of theſe fanatics in the hiſtory of the thirteenth century, in which they were firſt drawn from their obſcurity, and condemned in many councils, eſpecially in *Germany*. It is, however, certain, that they had a clandeſtine exiſtence long before that period, and that they propagated their tenets ſecretly in ſeveral places. Their doctrine reſembles, in ſome particulars, that of the Manichæans; and hence it was natural for the ignorant divines of the age in which they lived, to conſider them as a branch of that pernicious ſect.

IV. We find in hiſtory another branch of this numerous ſect, whoſe errors were not accompanied with the crimes that were laid to the charge of their brethren, and who were converted by a pathetic diſcourſe that was addreſſed to them by GERHARD, biſhop of *Cambray* and *Arras*, in an aſſembly of the clergy that was held in the laſt of theſe two cities A. D. 1030. Theſe honeſt *Myſtics*, who were equally remarkable for their docility and their ignorance, had received the doctrine they profeſſed from the Italians, and particularly from a certain chimerical doctor, whoſe name was GUNDULF. They maintained in general, according to their own confeſſion, that the whole of religion conſiſted in the ſtudy of practical piety, and in a courſe of action conformable to the divine laws, and treated all external modes of worſhip with the utmoſt contempt. Their particular tenets may be reduced to the following heads: 1. They rejected baptiſm, and in a more eſpecial manner, the baptiſm of infants, as a ceremony that was in no reſpect eſſential to ſalvation. 2. They rejected, for the ſame reaſon, the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper. 3. They denied, that the churches were endowed with a greater degree of ſanctity than private houſes, or that they were more adapted to the worſhip of God than any other place. 4. They affirmed, that the altars were to be conſidered in no other light than as heaps of ſtones, and were therefore unworthy of any marks of veneration or regard. 5. They diſapproved of the uſe of incenſe and conſecrated oil in ſervices of a religious nature. 6. They looked upon the uſe of bells in the churches, as an intolerable ſuperſtition. 7. They denied, that the eſtabliſhment of biſhops, preſbyters, deacons, and other eccleſiaſtical dignities, was of divine inſtitution, and went ſo far

Another branch of that ſect converted by Gerhard.

as

CENT. XI. PART II.

as to maintain that the appointment of ſtated miniſters in the church was entirely needleſs. 8. They affirmed, that the inſtitution of funeral rites was an effect of ſacerdotal avarice, and that it was a matter of indifference whether the dead were buried in the churches, or in the fields. 9. They looked upon thoſe voluntary puniſhments, called *penance*, which were ſo generally practiſed in this century, as unprofitable and abſurd. 10. They denied, that the ſins of departed ſpirits could be, in any meaſure, atoned for by the celebration of *maſſes*, the diſtribution of alms to the poor, or a *vicarious penance* [*w*]; and they treated, of conſequence, the doctrine of purgatory as a ridiculous fable. 11. They conſidered marriage as a pernicious inſtitution, and abſurdly condemned, without diſtinction, all connubial bonds [*x*]. 12. They looked upon a certain ſort of veneration and worſhip as due to the *apoſtles* and *martyrs*, from which, however, they excluded ſuch as were only *confeſſors*, in which claſs they comprehended the *ſaints*, who had not ſuffered death for the cauſe of CHRIST, and whoſe bodies, in their eſteem, had nothing more ſacred than any other human carcaſe. 13. They declared the uſe of inſtrumental muſic in the churches, and other religious aſſemblies, ſuperſtitious and unlawful. 14. They denied, that the croſs on which CHRIST ſuffered was in any reſpect more ſacred than other kinds of wood, and, of conſe-

☞ [*w*] By a *vicarious penance* is underſtood the courſe of mortification and voluntary ſuffering, that one perſon undergoes in order to procure abſolution for another.

[*x*] This eleventh article is ſcarcely credible, at leaſt as it is here expreſſed. It is more reaſonable to ſuppoſe that theſe Myſtics did not abſolutely condemn marriage, but only held celibacy in higher eſteem, as a mark of ſuperior ſanctity and virtue.

quence,

quence, refuſed to pay to it the ſmalleſt degree of religious worſhip. 15. They not only refuſed all acts of adoration to the images of CHRIST, and of the ſaints, but were alſo for having them removed out of the churches. 16. They were ſhocked at the ſubordination and diſtinctions that were eſtabliſhed among the clergy, and at the different degrees of authority that were conferred upon the different members of that ſacred body [*y*].

When we conſider the corrupt ſtate of religion in this century, and particularly, the ſuperſtitious notions that were generally adopted in relation to outward ceremonies, the efficacy of penance and the ſanctity of churches, relics, and images, it will not appear ſurpriſing, that many perſons of good ſenſe and ſolid piety, running from one extreme to another, fell into the opinions of theſe Myſtics, in which, among ſeveral abſurdities, there were many things plauſible and ſpecious, and ſome highly rational.

The controverſy ſet on foot by Roſcellinus.

V. A controverſy, of a much more ſubtile and difficult nature, aroſe in *France*, about the year 1089; and had for its principal author ROSCELLINUS, a canon of *Compeigne*, a profound dialectician, and the moſt eminent doctor of the ſect called *Nominaliſts*, which we have already had occaſion to mention in the courſe of this hiſtory. This ſubtile doctor held it inconceivable and impoſſible, that the Son of God ſhould take on the human nature alone, *i. e.* without the Father and the Holy Ghoſt becoming incarnate alſo, unleſs by the three perſons in the godhead were meant three diſtinct *objects*, or natures exiſting ſeparately (ſuch as three angels, or three diſtinct ſpirits),

[*y*] See an account of the ſynod of *Arras* in DACHERIUS, *Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter.* tom. i. p. 607—624.—CAR. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 7.

though

though endowed with one will, and acting by one power. When it was inſinuated to ROSCELLINUS, that this manner of reaſoning led directly to *Tritheiſm*, or the doctrine of three gods, he anſwered boldly, that the exiſtence of three gods might be aſſerted with truth [z], were not the expreſſion harſh

[z] Such is the account given by JOHN, the accuſer of this metaphyſical eccleſiaſtic, in a letter to ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, publiſhed by BALUZIUS, in his *Miſcellanea*, tom. iv. p. 478. The ſame account is confirmed by ANSELM himſelf, in the book *De Fide Trinitatis*, which he wrote againſt ROSCELLINUS, ſee *Oper.* tom. i. p. 41. 43. and lib. ii. *Epiſtolar.* ep. xxxv. p. 335. tom. ii. opp.—And alſo by FULCO, biſhop of *Beauvais*, as may be ſeen in the ſecond book of the *Epiſtles of* ANSELM, ep. xli. lib. ii. tom. ii. opp. p. 357.—It muſt, however, be conſidered, that the learned men now mentioned were the inveterate enemies of ROSCELLINUS, and that they perhaps comprehended his meaning imperfectly, or perverted it willingly. Several circumſtances prove that ſome of his adverſaries were in one or the other of theſe two caſes. ANSELM himſelf furniſhes ſufficient grounds for this ſuſpicion, ſince, notwithſtanding his averſion to the *Nominaliſts*, of whom ROSCELLINUS was the chief, he grants, in his book *De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. iii. p. 44. that the opinion of his antagoniſt may be admitted, or at leaſt tolerated, in a certain ſenſe; and even frequently intimates, that he is not perfectly aſſured of his underſtanding fully the meaning of ROSCELLINUS, and that he believes the ſentiments of that eccleſiaſtic leſs pernicious than his accuſers have repreſented them. *Sed forſitan* (ſays ANSELM) *ipſe* (ROSCELLINUS) *non dicit, ſicut ſunt tres anima aut tres* Angeli: *ſed ille, qui mihi ejus mandavit quæſtionem, hanc ex ſuo poſuit ſimilitudinem: ſed ſolum modo tres perſonas affirmat eſſe tres* RES, *ſine additamento alicujus ſimilitudinis.* The ſame ANSELM (*Epiſtolar.* lib. ii. ep. xli. p. 357.) declares, that the account which he had received of the opinions of ROSCELLINUS appears to him extremely dubious, *Quod tamen* (ſays he) *abſque dubitate credere non poſſum.* From all this it is evident, that ANSELM was far from having an entire confidence in the equity and impartiality of the accuſers of ROSCELLINUS, or from looking upon that eccleſiaſtic as ſo black, as his enemies had endeavoured to make him.

As to the merits of the cauſe, it appears manifeſt to me, that this ſubtile diſpute was a conſequence of the warm controverſy that ſubſiſted, in this century, between the *Realiſts* and the

harſh and contrary to the phraſeology generally received. He was, however, obliged to retract this error in a council aſſembled at *Soiſſons*, in the year 1092; but he reſumed it when the council was diſmiſſed, and the danger over. Perſecuted anew on account of his doctrine, he took refuge in *England*, and excited there diviſions and conteſts of another kind, by maintaining, among other things, that perſons born out of lawful wedlock ought to be deemed incapable of admiſſion to holy orders. This doctrine, which was by no means ſuited to the times, procured ROSCELLINUS many enemies, and was in a great meaſure the occaſion of his involuntary removal from *England*. Baniſhed thence, he returned to *France*, and taking up his reſidence at *Paris*, he fomented again the old diſpute concerning the Trinity. This, however, ſucceeded not according to his hopes, but expoſed him to much trouble and vexation from the redoubled attacks of his adverſaries, who preſſed hard on him from all quarters. Fatigued [redacted] their perſecutions, he retired at laſt to *Aquita*[redacted]e he acquired univerſal eſteem

CENT. XI. PART I

* *Nominaliſts*.] The former attacked the latter by the dangerous concluſions that ſeemed deducible from their principles, and reaſoned thus: "If, as your doctrine ſuppoſes, *univerſal ſubſtances* are no more than mere *ſounds* or *denominations*, and "the whole ſcience of logic is only converſant about words, "it muſt of neceſſity follow, that the three perſons in the "Godhead, are only three NAMES, and not three REALITIES "or THINGS. We deny the concluſion, replied ROSCELLINUS; the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are not placed "by us in the rank of DENOMINATIONS, but in the claſs of "REALITIES or THINGS." The ſubtile doctor here, as all muſt more or leſs do after him, by avoiding *Scylla*, fell into *Charybdis*, and was charged, by his adverſaries, with the introduction of tritheiſm, by holding an opinion, that ſuppoſed the exiſtence of three divine ſubſtances. Were any of the writings of ROSCELLINUS now extant, they would help us, no doubt, to form a juſter notion of this controverſy than we can have at preſent.

by

by his eminent piety, and paſſed the reſt of his days in tranquillity and repoſe [*a*].

[*a*] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 485. 489.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 262.—*Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 358.—ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baronium ad A.* 1094. tom. iv. p. 317.—JAQUES LONGUEBAL, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. viii. p. 59.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

00110766

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 09 July, 2016